

1 point in the land use planning process for certain types of projects regarding
2 preservation of Native American places of prehistoric, archaeological, cultural,
3 spiritual, and ceremonial importance, which would include human remains
4 associated with prehistoric Native Americans.

5 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.5.3 states, "If human remains are encountered during
6 a public or private construction activity, California Health and Safety Code Section
7 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County
8 Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section
9 5097.98. The Riverside County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours. If the
10 Coroner determines that the burial is not historic, but prehistoric, the Native
11 American Heritage Commission must be contacted to determine the most likely
12 descendant for this area. The most likely descendant may become involved with the
13 disposition of the burial following scientific analysis."

14 Determination: Because most uncovered human remains and/or associated burial artifacts
15 are of historical or prehistoric eras, they tend to be handled in a manner similar to
16 archaeological resources. In this aspect, the regulatory measures outlined for
17 previously discussed impacts to historical and archaeological resources provide
18 specific provisions that also apply for buried human remains. Mitigation measure
19 MM 3.5.3 ensures that unexpected human remains of modern origin discovered
20 during future construction activities would be examined by a Riverside County
21 Coroner and left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to their
22 treatment and disposition has been made pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. This
23 measure, along with previously identified regulatory measures outlined for impacts
24 to historical and archaeological resources, would reduce this impact to a less than
25 cumulatively considerable level.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 E. Geology and Soils

2 11. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.6.1) *Fault Rupture Hazards*

3 The proposed Project would accommodate future development of both high-density
4 residential and mixed-use development. If said development were to occur on or in
5 the vicinity of known earthquake faults or as-yet undetected earthquake faults, the
6 number of people and the amount of developed property exposed to fault rupture
7 hazards, and thus the potential for property loss, injury, or death, would be increased.

8 Regulations: Compliance with General Plan policies and County regulations would reduce
9 fault rupture hazards. These include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA 960
10 Policy S 2.1 (RCIP GP Policy S 2.1), which requires geologic studies or analyses for
11 high-occupancy structures within 0.5 mile of all Quaternary to historic faults shown
12 on the Earthquake Fault Studies Zones map; Riverside County Ordinance No. 547,
13 which establishes that projects located in an earthquake fault zone must comply with
14 all provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act; and County
15 Municipal Code Chapter 15.60, Earthquake Fault Area Construction Regulations,
16 which regulate numerous aspects of design to ensure that structures and facilities are
17 designed with the appropriate level of seismic safety warranted by the geology of
18 their location.

19 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.6.1 states, "Before a project is approved or otherwise
20 permitted within an Alquist-Priolo Zone, County Fault Zone, within 150 feet of any
21 other active or potentially active fault mapped in a published US Geologic Survey or
22 California Geological Survey reports, or within other potential earthquake hazard
23 area (as determined by the County Geologist), a site-specific geologic investigation
24 shall be prepared to assess potential seismic hazards resulting from development of
25 the Project site. The site-specific geotechnical investigation shall incorporate up-to-
26 date data from government and nongovernment sources.

27 Based on the site-specific geotechnical investigation, no structures intended for
28 human occupancy shall be constructed across active faults. This site-specific

1 evaluation and written report shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be
2 submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of
3 building permits. If an active fault is discovered, any structure intended for human
4 occupancy shall be set back at least 50 feet from the fault. A larger or smaller setback
5 may be established if such a setback is supported by adequate evidence presented to
6 and accepted by the County Geologist.”

7 Determination: Compliance with both General Plan policies and mitigation measure MM
8 3.6.1 would ensure a site-specific geologic investigation for future development and
9 would ensure that no habitable structure would be built on an active fault and that
10 the design of structures in fault zones would include seismic safety measures, thus
11 minimizing the potential for fault rupture to affect the structure and cause loss, injury,
12 or death. This impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable
13 level.

14 12. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.6.2) Seismic Hazards

15 The proposed project would accommodate future development throughout the
16 County, which could increase the exposure of persons and property to seismic
17 hazards, including strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure
18 including liquefaction, and landslides.

19 Regulations: GPA 960 Policies S 2.5 through S 2.7 (RCIP GP Policies S 2.5 through S 2.7)
20 require that engineered slopes be designed to resist seismically induced failure, that
21 cut and fill transition lots be over-excavated to mitigate the potential of seismically
22 induced differential settlement, and that fill depths beneath structures have a 100
23 percent maximum variation to mitigate the potential of seismically induced
24 differential settlement.

25 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.6.2 states, “The design and construction of structures
26 and facilities shall adhere to the standards and requirement detailed in the California
27 Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24), County Building Code,
28 and/or professional engineering standards appropriate for the seismic zone in which

1 such construction may occur. Conformance with these design standards shall be
2 enforced through building plan review and approval by the Riverside County
3 Department of Building and Safety prior to the issuance of building permits for any
4 structure or facility.”

5 Mitigation measure MM 3.6.3 states, “As determined by the County Geologist, a
6 site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential ground shaking
7 impacts resulting from development. The site-specific ground shaking assessment
8 shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and nongovernment sources and
9 may be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation required in
10 mitigation measure MM 3.6.1. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall
11 include specific measures to reduce the significance of potential ground shaking
12 hazards. This site-specific ground shaking assessment shall be prepared by a licensed
13 geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval
14 prior to the issuance of building permits.”

15 Mitigation Measure MM 3.6.4 states, “As determined by the County Geologist, a
16 site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential liquefaction impacts
17 resulting from development. The site-specific liquefaction assessment shall
18 incorporate up-to-date data from government and nongovernment sources and may
19 be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation required in
20 mitigation measure MM 3.6.1. This site-specific liquefaction assessment shall be
21 prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for
22 review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.”

23 Mitigation measure MM 3.6.5 states, “Where development is proposed within an
24 identified or potential liquefaction hazard area (as determined by the County
25 Geologist), adequate and appropriate measures such as (but not limited to) design
26 foundations in a manner that limits the effects of liquefaction, the placement of an
27 engineered fill with low liquefaction potential, and the alternative siting of structures
28 in areas with a lower liquefaction risk, shall be implemented to reduce potential

liquefaction hazards. Any such measures shall be submitted to the Riverside County Geologist and the County Department of Building and Safety for review prior to the approval of the building permits.”

Determination: Compliance with mitigation measures and General Plan policy provisions would ensure that the site-specific geologic conditions of future development proposals would be evaluated and that regulatory and mitigation measures to reduce seismic hazards, including strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction, and landslides, would be applied. For these reasons, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

13. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.6.3) *Erosion and Loss of Topsoil*

As human activities that remove vegetation or disturb soil are the biggest contributor to erosion potential, areas exposed during future development activities accommodated by the proposed Project would be prone to erosion and loss of topsoil.

Regulations: Riverside County Ordinance 457 requires a grading permit for most earthmoving operations in the County. The Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or the Riverside County Geologist would identify conditions of approval to be completed prior to issuance of a grading permit, including erosion and sediment control plans. In addition, future development projects disturbing 1 or more acres of soil, or projects disturbing less than 1 acre but that are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs 1 or more acres, are also required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2012-0006-DWQ), which requires the development and implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan that lists best management practices (BMPs) to be used to protect stormwater runoff and the placement of those BMPs.

Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.6.6 states, “New development in identified or potential (as determined by the County Geologist) wind hazard areas shall adhere to applicable provisions of Riverside County Ordinance No. 484.2 or other local, state,

1 or federal requirements established to control or limit the windborne erosion of soil.
2 Prior to the approval of development permits, the County Building and Safety
3 Department shall confirm that the design of any proposed structure, facility, or use
4 incorporates appropriate features to control and/or limit the windborne erosion of
5 soil.”

6 Mitigation Measure MM 3.6.7 states, “Riverside County, where required, and in
7 accordance with issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
8 permit, shall require the construction and/or grading contractor for individual
9 developments to establish and implement specific best management practices at time
10 of project implementation.”

11 Prior to any development in the County, a grading plan shall be submitted to the
12 Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside County
13 Geologist for review and approval. As required by the County, the grading plan shall
14 include erosion and sediment control plans. Measures in individual erosion control
15 plans may include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

- 16 a. Grading and development plans shall be designed in a manner which
17 minimizes the amount of terrain modification.
- 18 b. Surface water shall be controlled and diverted around potential landslide
19 areas to prevent erosion and saturation of slopes.
- 20 c. Structures shall not be sited on or below identified landslides unless
21 landslides are stabilized.
- 22 d. The extent and duration of ground-disturbing activities during and
23 immediately following periods of rain shall be limited, to avoid the potential
24 for erosion which may be accelerated by rainfall on exposed soils.
- 25 e. To the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill shall be balanced.
- 26 f. The amount of water entering and exiting a graded site shall be limited though
27 the placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices.
28

1 g. Erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted to the County for
2 review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits.”

3 Measure MM 3.6.9 states, “Where required, drainage design measures shall be
4 incorporated into the final design of individual projects on-site. These measures shall
5 include, but will not be limited to, the following:

6 a. Runoff entering developing areas shall be collected into surface and
7 subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages.

8 b. Runoff generated above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas shall be
9 captured and conveyed to nearby drainages.

10 c. Runoff generated on paved or covered areas shall be conveyed via swales
11 and drains to natural drainage courses.

12 d. Disturbed areas that have been identified as highly erosive shall be
13 (re)vegetated.

14 e. Irrigation systems shall be designed, installed, and maintained in a manner
15 which minimizes runoff.

16 f. The landscape scheme for projects within the Project site shall utilize
17 drought-tolerant plants.

18 g. Erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, and small check dams may
19 be utilized in gullies and active stream channels to reduce erosion.”

20 Determination: Compliance with grading permit requirements, National Pollutant Discharge
21 Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, and mitigation measures would ensure
22 that future development would conduct the appropriate studies at an early stage to
23 determine the potential for erosion and identify the necessary plans and BMPs to
24 prevent it, thus significantly reducing the potential for substantial erosion or topsoil
25 loss that occurs in association with new development. For these reasons, impacts
26 would be reduced to less than cumulatively considerable levels for future
27 development under the Project.
28

14. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.6.4) Be located on a Geologic Unit or Soil that is Unstable, or that would become Unstable as a result of the Project, and Potentially Result in on or off-site Landslide, Lateral Spreading, Subsidence, Liquefaction or Collapse

Future development accommodated by the proposed Project could result in the construction and occupation of structures in areas underlain by unstable or expansive soils.

Regulations: Compliance with General Plan policies and California Building Code regulations would reduce impacts associated with unstable or expansive soils. These include, but are not limited to, the following: Title 24 of the California Building Code (CBC), which addresses construction of structures in areas subject to unstable and expansive soils by requiring testing for expansive soils and the implementation of appropriate mitigation, special engineering designs, including the use of reinforcing steel in foundations, drainage control devices, over-excavation, and backfilling with nonexpansive soil, are used to alleviate problems caused by expansive soils; and required geotechnical studies for new development in landslide potential hazard management zones (GPA 960 and RCIP GP Policy S 3.1), documented subsidence zones (GPA 960 and RCIP GP Policy S 3.8), and areas with the potential for liquefaction (GPA 960 and RCIP GP Policy S 2.2).

Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.6.10 states, "Proponents of new development in Riverside County shall adhere to applicable policies and standards contained in the most recent version of the California Building Code related to the construction of structures and facilities on expansive soils."

Determination: General Plan and CBC requirements would ensure that future development would conduct geotechnical studies addressing site-specific geology, slopes, and soil stability, as well as the requirements for grading, site preparation, and building foundations. Development would also be required to implement appropriate mitigation per CBC requirements for construction on expansive soils as addressed

1 by mitigation measure MM 3.6.10. For these reasons, impacts related to soil
2 instability would be reduced to less than cumulatively considerable levels for future
3 development under the Project.

4 F. Hydrology and Water Quality

5 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.1) *Violate Water Quality Standards or*
6 *Waste Discharge Requirements*

7 The proposed project would facilitate increased urbanization throughout the County,
8 which has the potential to result in alterations to existing hydrology, increases in
9 impervious surfaces, increases in urban runoff, and increases in wastewater discharge,
10 all of which could increase the discharge of pollutants into receiving waters and
11 violate water quality standards.

12 Regulations: To protect (or restore) water quality, the RWQCBs enforce the Clean Water
13 Act through the NPDES, as well as the state of California's Water Code. Pursuant to
14 these regulations, permits from the applicable RWQCB are required for a wide variety
15 of activities with potential to discharge wastes into waters of the state or waters of the
16 United States, including construction and operational activities. All construction
17 activities are required to obtain and comply with NPDES permits, stormwater
18 pollution prevention plans, and water quality management plans to prevent or
19 minimize construction-related water quality impacts and waste discharges,
20 particularly as related to soils, i.e., erosion, sedimentation, and fill deposition. All
21 developed uses conveying water into existing storm drain systems must comply with
22 County of Riverside MS4 permit conditions and the associated Master Drainage Plan
23 standards (if applicable). Projects must also comply with Clean Water Act Sections
24 401 and 404 if waters of the United States would be disturbed. In addition, GPA 960
25 Policies OS 3.7 and OS 4.6 encourage the incorporation of low-impact development
26 (LID) features in new development, such as permeable parking bays and lots, use of
27 less pavement, biofiltration, and use of multifunctional open drainage systems.

1 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.9.1 states, “The development of septic systems shall
2 be in accordance with applicable standards established by Riverside County and other
3 responsible authorities.”

4 Mitigation measure MM 3.9.2 states, “Point source pollution reduction programs shall
5 fully adhere to applicable standards required by federal, state, and local agencies.
6 Prior to the approval of individual projects, Riverside County shall verify that the
7 provisions of applicable point source pollution programs have been satisfied.”

8 Mitigation measure MM 3.9.3 states, “Where development may contribute to a
9 worsening of local or regional ground or surface water quality (as determined by the
10 RCDEH and/or applicable RWQCB), a water quality analysis shall be prepared. The
11 water quality analysis shall include but not be limited to: an analysis of existing
12 surface and subsurface water quality; an assessment of how the proposed development
13 would affect existing water quality; an assessment of how the proposed development
14 would affect beneficial uses of the water; and specific measures to limit or eliminate
15 potential water quality impacts and/or impacts to beneficial uses of ground/surface
16 water. Where determined necessary by the County of Riverside or other responsible
17 entities, the water quality analysis shall include, at an equal level of detail, potential
18 impacts to tributary or downstream areas. The water quality analysis shall be
19 submitted to the County of Riverside and the applicable RWQCB for review and shall
20 be approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical
21 modification of the Project site.”

22 Mitigation measure MM 3.9.4 states, “The project applicant shall submit to the
23 County of Riverside and the applicable RWQCB, for review and approval, evidence
24 that the specific measures to limit or eliminate potential water quality impacts
25 resulting from the entire development process will be implemented as set forth in the
26 water quality analysis. Said evidence shall be submitted and approved prior to the
27 issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of the
28 Project site.”

1 Determination: These County, state, and federal regulations, including General Plan policies
2 and NPDES requirements, as well as mitigation measures MM 3.9.1 through MM
3 3.9.4 would ensure no significant violations of water quality standards or waste
4 discharge requirements occur by requiring the incorporation of specific measures to
5 limit or eliminate potential water quality impacts resulting from the entire
6 development process, as well as provisions implementing applicable point source
7 pollution programs. Therefore, impacts associated with violations of water quality
8 standards or waste discharge requirements from future development accommodated
9 by the Project would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

10 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.3) *Substantially Deplete Groundwater*
11 *Supplies or Interfere Substantially with Groundwater Recharge such that there would*
12 *be a Net Deficit in Aquifer Volume or a Lowering of the Local Groundwater Table*
13 *Level*

14 The increase in density/intensity potential resulting from the Project would
15 accommodate increased urbanization throughout the unincorporated County, which
16 could contribute to a cumulative increase in impervious surfaces and a decrease in
17 water infiltration and natural groundwater recharge rates throughout the
18 unincorporated County.

19 Regulations: Future development accommodated by the Project would be required to comply
20 with policies ensuring that natural recharge areas are preserved in new development
21 to the extent feasible, including, but not limited to: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP GP
22 LU 4.1), which incorporates water conservation techniques, such as groundwater
23 recharge basins, use of porous pavement, drought-tolerant landscaping, and water
24 recycling, as appropriate; and GPA 960 Policies OS 4.3 through 4.8 (RCIP GP
25 Policies OS 4.3 through 4.6), which specifically address recharge areas, requiring that
26 natural drainage systems be incorporated into developments where appropriate and
27 feasible and that adequate aquifer water recharge areas are preserved and protected.

1 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.9.6 states, "In areas where it is not practical to
2 conserve soils suitable for recharge (as determined by the Riverside County Flood
3 Control and Water Conservation District), water harvesting and recharge facilities
4 shall be built within the same groundwater basin in which the recharge area is lost.
5 The construction of replacement recharge areas shall equal the amount of recharge
6 area lost and/or shall incorporate equipment or facilities capable of replacing (at an
7 equal volume) the amount of groundwater recharge capacity lost as a result of
8 development. The identification, designation, location, or installation of replacement
9 groundwater recharge capacity shall be reviewed and approved by the Riverside
10 County Flood Control and Water Conservation District prior to the issuance of
11 grading permits."

12 Mitigation measure MM 3.9.7 states, "New development that includes more than 1
13 acre of impervious surface area (e.g., roofs, parking areas, streets, sidewalk) shall
14 incorporate features to facilitate the on-site infiltration of precipitation and/or runoff
15 into groundwater basins. Such features shall include but not be limited to: natural
16 drainage systems (where economically feasible); detention basins incorporated into
17 project landscaping; and the installation of porous areas within parking areas. Where
18 natural drainage systems are utilized for groundwater recharge, they shall be managed
19 using natural approaches (as modified to safeguard public health and safety).
20 Groundwater recharge features shall be included on development plans and shall be
21 reviewed by the Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or Riverside
22 County Flood Control and Water Conservation District prior to the issuance of
23 grading permits."

24 Determination: The General Plan policies encourage the natural management of streams
25 where groundwater recharge is likely to occur and the mitigation measures require the
26 construction of replacement recharge areas or the incorporation of equipment or
27 facilities capable of replacing (at an equal volume) the amount of groundwater
28 recharge capacity lost as a result of development. For these reasons, cumulative

1 groundwater recharge impacts associated with the proposed Project would be reduced
2 to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

- 3 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.4) Substantially Alter the Drainage
4 Patterns of the Site or Area, Including through the Alteration of the course of a Stream
5 or River, in a manner which would result in substantial Erosion or Siltation on- or
6 off-site; Substantially Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern of the Site or Area,
7 including through the Alteration of the Course of a Stream or River, or Substantially
8 Increase the Rate or Amount of Surface Runoff in a Manner which would result in
9 Flooding on- or off-site

10 The increase in density/intensity potential resulting from the Project would
11 accommodate increased urbanization throughout the unincorporated County, which
12 could substantially alter existing drainage patterns. This could result in increased
13 erosion potential in areas of new construction (due to vegetation removal, topsoil
14 disturbance, etc.), as well as an increase in impervious surfaces, associated stormwater
15 runoff, and subsequent flow in surface water drainages resulting in flooding.

16 Regulations: Riverside County Ordinance No. 457 requires a grading permit for most
17 earthmoving operations in the County. As part of the grading permit process, the
18 Riverside County Building and Safety Department and/or the Riverside County
19 Geologist identifies conditions of approval, including erosion and sediment control
20 plans, to minimize terrain modification, control surface water and divert around
21 potential landslide areas to prevent erosion and saturation of slopes, limit extent and
22 duration of ground-disturbing activities during and immediately following periods of
23 rain, balance the amount of cut and fill, and erosion control devices to limit the amount
24 of water entering and exiting a graded site. Additionally, NPDES and County
25 requirements (Ordinance No. 754) would ensure that future development would
26 control the amount and quality of stormwater runoff leaving construction sites.
27 Postconstruction runoff is also addressed and mitigated through site design and
28 various requirements of state of California and County of Riverside programs, such

1 as Riverside County's MS4 permit requirements for new development and substantial
2 redevelopment, as well as standard Riverside County conditions of approval.

3 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.9.8 states, "For each new development project, the
4 following principles and policies shall be considered and implemented:

- 5 a. Avoid or limit disturbance to natural water bodies and drainage systems
6 (including ephemeral drainage systems) when feasible. Provide adequate
7 buffers of native vegetation along drainage systems to lessen erosion and
8 protect water quality.
- 9 b. Appropriate BMPs must be implemented to lessen impacts to waters of the
10 United States and/or waters of the state resulting from development.
11 Drainages should be left in a natural condition or modified in a way that
12 preserves all existing water quality standards where feasible. Any discharges
13 of sediment or other wastes, including wastewater, to waters of the United
14 States or waters of the state must be avoided to the maximum extent
15 practicable. All such discharges will require an NPDES permit issued by
16 applicable RWQCB.
- 17 c. Small drainages shall be preserved and incorporated into new development,
18 along with adequate buffer zones of native vegetation, to the maximum extent
19 practicable.
- 20 d. Any impacts to waters of the United States require a Section 401 Water
21 Quality Standards Certification from the RWQCB. Impacts to these waters
22 shall be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Where avoidance is not
23 practicable, impacts to these waters shall be minimized to the maximum
24 extent practicable. Mitigation of unavoidable impacts must, at a minimum,
25 replace the full function and value of the affected water body. Impacts to
26 waters of the United States also require a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit
27 from the USACE and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW.
28

- 1 e. The County of Riverside shall encourage the use of pervious materials in
2 development to retain absorption and allow more percolation of stormwater
3 into the ground. The use of pervious materials, such as grass or
4 permeable/porous pavement, for runoff channels and parking areas shall also
5 be encouraged. Lining runoff channels with impermeable surfaces, such as
6 concrete or grouted riprap, will be discouraged.
- 7 f. The County of Riverside shall encourage construction of detention basins or
8 holding ponds and/or constructed wetlands within a project site to capture
9 and treat dry weather urban runoff and the first flush of rainfall runoff. These
10 basins should be designed to detain runoff for a minimum time, such as 24
11 hours, to allow particles and associated pollutants to settle and to provide for
12 natural treatment.
- 13 g. The County of Riverside shall encourage development to retain areas of open
14 space as natural or landscaped to aid in the recharge and retention of runoff.
15 Native plant materials shall be used in replanting and hydroseeding
16 operations, where feasible.
- 17 h. The County of Riverside shall require that environmental documents for
18 proposed projects in areas tributary to Canyon Lake Reservoir, Lake Elsinore,
19 sections of the Santa Ana River, Fulmar Lake, and Mill Creek (as a result of
20 the proposed 2002 303 (d) listing of these water bodies) include discharge
21 prohibitions, revisions to discharge permits, or management plans to address
22 water quality impacts in accordance with the controls that may be applied
23 pursuant to state and federal regulation. Environmental documents shall
24 acknowledge that additional requirements may be imposed in the future for
25 projects in areas tributary to the water bodies listed above.
- 26 i. The County of Riverside shall ensure that in new development,
27 postdevelopment stormwater runoff flow rates do not differ from the
28 predevelopment stormwater runoff flow rates.

- 1 j. All construction projects should be designed and implemented to protect, and
2 if at all possible, to improve the quality of the underlying groundwater.
- 3 k. The County of Riverside shall encourage the enhancement of groundwater
4 recharge wherever possible. Measures such as keeping stream/river channels
5 and floodplains in natural conditions or with pervious surfaces, as well as
6 keeping areas of high recharge as open space, will be considered.
- 7 l. The County of Riverside shall prohibit the discharge of waste material
8 resulting from any type of construction into any drainage areas, channels,
9 streambeds, streams, lakes, wetlands, or rivers. Spoil sites shall be prohibited
10 within any streams or areas where spoil material could be washed into a water
11 body.
- 12 m. The County of Riverside shall require that appropriate BMPs be developed
13 and implemented during construction efforts to control the discharge of
14 pollutants, prevent sewage spills, and to avoid discharge of sediments into
15 the streets, stormwater conveyance channels, or waterways.”

16 Mitigation measures MM 3.9.9 states, “Where development may interfere with,
17 disrupt, or otherwise affect surface or subsurface hydrologic baseline conditions (as
18 determined by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District,
19 the USACE, the CDFW, and/or the RWQCB), preparation of a project-specific
20 hydrologic study shall be required. The hydrologic study shall include but shall not
21 be limited to: an inventory of surface and subsurface hydrologic conditions existing
22 at the time of the study; an analysis of how the proposed development would affect
23 these hydrologic baseline conditions; and specific measures to limit or eliminate the
24 interference or disruption of the on-site hydrologic process. The hydrologic study
25 shall evaluate the feasibility of incorporating bioengineering measures into any
26 project that may alter the hydrologic process. Where required by the County of
27 Riverside, the hydrologic study shall include analysis of, at an equal level of detail,
28 potential impacts to tributary or downstream areas. The hydrologic study shall be

1 submitted to the County or responsible entity for review and shall be approved prior
2 to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical modification of
3 the Project site.”

4 Mitigation measures MM 3.9.10 states, “The project applicant shall submit to the
5 County of Riverside, for review and approval, evidence that the specific measures to
6 limit or eliminate the disruption or interference to the hydrologic process resulting
7 from the entire development process will be implemented as set forth in the
8 hydrologic study. Such evidence may take the form of but shall not be limited to: a
9 development agreement; land banking; the provision of adequate funds to guarantee
10 the construction, maintenance, or restoration of hydrologic features; or any other
11 mechanism that will achieve said goals. Said evidence shall be submitted and
12 approved prior to the issuance of any entitlement that would result in the physical
13 modification of the Project site.”

14 Mitigation measures MM 3.9.11 states, “Where determined feasible by Riverside
15 County or a responsible entity, bioengineering measures shall be incorporated into
16 any project that may alter the hydrologic process.”

17 Mitigation measures MM 3.9.12 states, “Riverside County shall not necessarily
18 require all land uses to withstand flooding. These may include land uses such as
19 agricultural, golf courses, and trails. For these land uses, flows shall not be
20 obstructed, and upstream and downstream properties shall not be adversely affected
21 by increased velocities, erosion backwater effects, concentration of flows, and
22 adverse impacts to water quality from point and nonpoint sources of pollution.”

23 Determination: Compliance with these regulations and mitigation measures would ensure
24 that future development would prepare a project-specific hydrologic study and
25 incorporate drainage systems and design measures and BMPs such that the
26 hydrologic process is not disrupted. Therefore, future development would be
27 required to control stormwater runoff and mitigate hydrologic impacts to a less than
28 cumulatively considerable level.

1 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.5) Create or Contribute Runoff Water
2 which would Exceed the Capacity of Existing or Planned Stormwater Drainage
3 Systems or Provide Substantial Additional Sources of Polluted Runoff

4 Future development accommodated by the Project would increase stormwater runoff
5 entering the County's storm drain system.

6 Regulations: NPDES and County requirements as described under the finding for Impact
7 Analyses 3.9.1 and 3.9.4 would ensure that future development would control the
8 amount and quality of stormwater runoff leaving construction and development sites,
9 which would also reduce the amount of stormwater runoff entering the County's
10 storm drainage system. In addition, GPA 960 Policy S 4.10 (RCIP GP Policy S 4.10)
11 specifically requires all proposed projects anywhere in Riverside County to address
12 and mitigate any adverse impacts that they may have on the carrying capacity of local
13 and regional storm drain systems.

14 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.9.8 as described under the finding for Impact Analysis
15 3.9.4.

16 Determination: These regulations and mitigation measure MM 3.9.8 would reduce runoff
17 impacts on the capacity of storm drain system resulting from implementation of
18 future development accommodated by the Project to a less than cumulatively
19 considerable impact.

20 5. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.6) Potential to Degrade Water Quality

21 Increased urbanization facilitated by the Project has the potential to result in
22 alterations to existing hydrology, increases in impervious surfaces, increases in urban
23 runoff, and increases in wastewater discharge, all of which have the potential to
24 degrade water quality.

25 Regulations: NPDES requirements for construction and operational activities as discussed
26 in Impact 3.9.1 Regulations.

27 Mitigation: Mitigation measures MM 3.9.1 through MM 3.9.7 as described under the
28 findings for Impact Analyses 3.9.1 through 3.9.3.

1 Determination: NPDES requirements and mitigation measures would reduce water quality
2 impacts associated with future projects facilitated by the Project to a less than
3 cumulatively considerable level.

4 6. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.7) *Flooding Hazards*

5 The proposed Project does not include site-specific development proposals,
6 entitlements, or other project components that would directly result in the placement
7 of housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Project does,
8 however, propose parcel-specific land use designation and zone classification
9 changes for approximately 368 parcels totaling 1,434.41 acres in the existing 100-
10 year floodplain. At the Countywide level, this would increase exposure of structures
11 and people to flood hazards, as well as impede or redirect flood flows.

12 Regulations: Compliance with Riverside County ordinances and General Plan policies
13 would prevent flooding impacts. These include, but are not limited to, the following:
14 Riverside County Ordinance No. 458, Regulating Flood Hazard Areas and
15 Implementing the National Flood Insurance Program, which includes specifications,
16 standards, and requirements to mitigate potential flood hazards in the County in
17 several ways, including reviewing all permit applications in the floodplain to
18 determine whether proposed building sites will be reasonably safe from flooding;
19 GPA 960 Policy S 4.1 (RCIP GP S 4.1), which requires new construction proposals
20 for residential and nonresidential development in 100-year floodplains to apply a
21 minimum level of acceptable risk, and requires the County to disapprove projects
22 that cannot mitigate the hazard to the satisfaction of the Building Official or another
23 responsible agency; GPA 960 Policy S 4.2 (RCIP GP S 4.2), which requires all
24 residential, commercial, and industrial structures to be flood-proofed from the
25 mapped 100-year storm flow; GPA 960 Policy S 4.3 (RCIP GP S 4.3), which
26 prohibits the construction of permanent structures for human housing or employment
27 to the extent necessary to convey floodwaters without property damage or risk to
28 public safety; and GPA 960 Policy S 4.4 (RCIP GP S 4.4), which prohibits alteration

1 of floodways and channelization unless alternative methods of flood control are not
2 technically feasible or unless alternative methods are utilized to the maximum extent
3 practicable.

4 Mitigation: Mitigation measures MM 3.9.15 states, "Riverside County shall require that all
5 structures (residential, commercial, and industrial) be flood-proofed from the 100-
6 year storm flows. In some cases, this may involve elevating the finished floor more
7 than 1 foot."

8 Mitigation measures MM 3.9.16 states, "Riverside County shall require that fully
9 enclosed areas that are below finished floors have openings to equalize the forces on
10 both sides of the walls."

11 Mitigation measures MM 3.9.17 states, "Provided the applicant does hydrological
12 studies, engineers structures to be safe from flooding, and provides evidence that the
13 structures will not adversely impact the floodplain, Riverside County may allow
14 development into the floodway fringe."

15 Determination: The County's regulations and policies, as well as mitigation measures MM
16 3.9.15 through MM 3.9.17, which require that projects that cannot mitigate flooding
17 hazards be disapproved; that structures would be adequately flood-proofed to ensure
18 people and property are not exposed to significant 100-year flood hazards; and that
19 future development would not significantly impede or redirect flood flows.
20 Therefore, impacts would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

21 G. Noise

22 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.12.2) Groundborne Vibration and Noise
23 Levels

24 Future development accommodated by the Project could expose residents to
25 groundborne vibration from existing vibration-producing land uses and roadway
26 truck and bus traffic, as well as construction and demolition activities. In addition,
27 the future development would result in temporary construction activities that could
28 expose existing sensitive receptors to groundborne vibration.

1 Regulations: Compliance with Riverside County General Plan policies would prevent
2 vibration impacts. These include, but are not limited to, the following: GPA 960
3 Policy N 16.1 (RCIP GP Policy N 15.1), which expressly restricts the placement of
4 sensitive land uses, including residential uses, in proximity to vibration-producing
5 land uses; GPA 960 Policy N 16.3 (RCIP GP Policy N 15.3), which prohibits the
6 exposure of residential dwellings to perceptible ground vibration from passing trains
7 as perceived at the ground or second floor; GPA 960 Policy N 15.2 (RCIP GP Policy
8 N 14.2), which requires that commercial and residential mixed-use structures
9 minimize the transfer or transmission of noise and vibration from the commercial
10 land use to the residential land use, which would apply to mixed-use development
11 facilitated by the Project; GPA 960 Policy N 13.2 (RCIP GP Policy N 12.2), which
12 requires the County to ensure that construction activities are restricted to established
13 hours of operation in order to prevent and/or mitigate the generation of excessive or
14 adverse noise impacts on surrounding areas.

15 Mitigation: Mitigation measure 3.12.5 states, “Prior to the issuance of any grading permit
16 for new development involving vibration-sensitive land uses (which shall include,
17 but not be limited to, hospitals, residential areas, concert halls, libraries, sensitive
18 research operations, schools and offices), the Project proponent shall provide
19 evidence to the County of Riverside that placement of such uses within the area
20 would not exceed groundborne vibration or groundborne noise impact criteria
21 identified by the FTA (for example, the standards shown in Table 3.12-1 of this EIR)
22 or as otherwise deemed appropriate for the situation by the County of Riverside”.

23 Determination: Compliance with General Plan policies and mitigation measure MM 3.12.5
24 would ensure that groundborne vibration levels associated with new development
25 would not be exceeded for sensitive development and would ensure that impacts
26 related to groundborne noise and vibration generation and exposure would be
27 reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level during operations. Due to the
28 temporary nature of the construction activity and its prohibition during the more

1 noise-sensitive nighttime hours, construction-related groundborne vibration, while
2 possibly annoying, would not be significant.

3 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.12.3) Construction-Related Noise

4 Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various
5 pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating
6 activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive
7 receptors. Major noise-generating construction activities associated with new
8 projects would include removal of existing pavement and structures, site grading and
9 excavation, installation of utilities, construction of building foundations, cores, and
10 shells, paving, and landscaping. The highest noise levels would be generated during
11 the demolition of existing structures when impact tools are used (e.g., jackhammers,
12 hoe rams) and during the construction of building foundations when impact pile
13 driving is required to support the structure. Site grading and excavation activities
14 would also generate high noise levels, as these phases often require the simultaneous
15 use of multiple pieces of heavy equipment such as dozers, excavators, scrapers, and
16 loaders. Lower noise levels result from building construction activities when these
17 activities move indoors and less heavy equipment is required to complete the tasks.
18 Construction equipment would typically include but not be limited to earthmoving
19 equipment and trucks, pile driving rigs, mobile cranes, compressors, pumps,
20 generators, paving equipment, and pneumatic, hydraulic, and electric tools.

21 Regulations: Under development and/or grading permit conditions of approval, as well as
22 Ordinance No. 847 and other regulations, the County of Riverside enacts a number
23 of noise controls on construction activities. These include limiting activities to
24 specific hours of the day (or severely restricting allowable noise levels after certain
25 hours, typically 10:00 p.m.), limiting idling, defining staging and loading locations
26 (away from adjacent homes, for example), and requiring setbacks, sound baffles, or
27 other equipment modifications, as appropriate for the situation.
28

1 Mitigation: Mitigation measure 3.12.6 states, “Prior to the issuance of any grading plans, the
2 County of Riverside shall condition approval of subdivisions adjacent to any
3 developed/occupied noise-sensitive land uses by requiring applicants to submit a
4 construction-related noise mitigation plan to the County for review and approval.
5 The plan should depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise
6 from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of the Project through use
7 of such methods as the following:

- 8 • The construction contractor shall use temporary noise attenuation fences
9 where feasible, to reduce construction noise impacts on adjacent noise-
10 sensitive land uses.
- 11 • During all project site excavation and grading on-site, the construction
12 contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with
13 properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer
14 standards. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction
15 equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors
16 nearest the Project site.
- 17 • The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will
18 create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and
19 noise-sensitive receptors nearest the Project site during all project
20 construction.
- 21 • The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that
22 would result in high noise levels to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00
23 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction shall be allowed on Sundays
24 and public holidays”.

25 Mitigation measure 3.12.7 states, “The construction-related noise mitigation plan
26 required shall also specify that haul truck deliveries be subject to the same hours
27 specified for construction equipment. Additionally, the plan shall denote any
28 construction traffic haul routes where heavy trucks would exceed 100 daily trips

(counting those both to and from the construction site). To the extent feasible, the plan shall denote haul routes that do not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings. Lastly, the construction-related noise mitigation plan shall incorporate any other restrictions imposed by Riverside County staff.”

Determination: Implementation of development and/or grading permit conditions of approval, as well as Ordinance No. 847, as well as a construction-related noise mitigation plan as required by MM 3.12.6 and MM 3.12.7, would ensure that noise controls would be placed on all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level.

H. Utilities and Service Systems

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.17.1) *Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements*

The proposed Project would accommodate increased density/intensity throughout the unincorporated County, which has the potential to increase the number of people and structures generating wastewater. Wastewater requires proper treatment to ensure it does not adversely affect receiving waters, for example, by elevating pollutant levels or introducing pathogens. Where connected to municipal sanitary sewer systems, wastewater generated as a result of the Project would be disposed of pursuant to the NPDES program/permits. Where sewer services are not available, development must rely on various types of septic systems or on-site waste treatment systems (OWTS), which typically result in percolation of wastewater into groundwater or to surface waters and could exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Regulations: The County regulates the construction of septic tanks in new development to ensure both adequate capacity for wastewater treatment and the protection of water quality. The minimum lot size required for each permanent structure utilizing an OWTS to handle its wastewater is 0.50 acre per structure, and construction of all new

1 septic facilities requires approval from the Riverside County Health Officer (County
2 Code Section 8.124.030 and Ordinance No. 650). Approval requires detailed review
3 and on-site inspections including a scaled, contoured plot plan, a soils feasibility
4 report that adequately evaluates soil percolation, a special feasibility boring report
5 (for groundwater and/or bedrock), and an engineered topographical map. County
6 Ordinance No. 650, Sewer Discharge in Unincorporated Territory, establishes a
7 variety of regulations regarding OWTS, including that the type of sewage facilities
8 installed shall be determined on the basis of location, soil porosity, site slope, and
9 groundwater level, and shall be designed to receive all sanitary sewage from the
10 property based on the higher volume estimation as determined by either the number
11 of bedrooms or plumbing fixture unit counts. Additionally, the EPA has standards
12 governing the placement of septic systems in proximity to water supply wells (see
13 Section 2.3, Regulatory Framework). Consistent with EPA standards, the County
14 prohibits the placement of conventional septic tanks/subsurface disposal systems
15 within any designated Zone A (classified as potential area of direct microbiological
16 and chemical contamination based on an estimated two-year time of contaminant
17 travel within an aquifer from the wellhead to the potential source of contamination)
18 of an EPA wellhead protection area.

19 Mitigation: Mitigation measure 3.17.1 states, "Conventional septic tanks/subsurface
20 disposal systems shall be prohibited within any designated Zone A of an EPA
21 wellhead protection area. Where a difference between Riverside County and EPA
22 septic tank setback distance requirements exists, the more restrictive standard shall
23 apply."

24 Mitigation measure 3.17.2 states, "The development of septic systems shall be in
25 accordance with applicable standards established by Riverside County and other
26 responsible authorities."

27 Determination: The above mitigation measures and regulations would ensure that septic
28 systems would be developed to protect water quality consistent with applicable

1 regulations and would thus be prevented from exceeding wastewater treatment
2 requirements. Therefore, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively
3 considerable level.

4 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.17.4) New or Expanded Stormwater
5 Drainage Facilities

6 Future development facilitated by the Project would require new stormwater
7 drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

8 Regulations: NPDES and County requirements would ensure that future development would
9 control the amount and quality of stormwater runoff leaving construction and
10 development sites, which would also reduce the amount of stormwater runoff
11 entering the County's storm drainage system. GPA 960/RCIP GP Policy S 4.10
12 specifically requires all proposed projects anywhere in Riverside County to address
13 and mitigate any adverse impacts that they may have on the carrying capacity of local
14 and regional storm drain systems.

15 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.9.8 as described under the finding for Impact Analysis
16 3.9.4 addresses drainage requirements for new development projects, including
17 requiring appropriate site BMPs to lessen stormwater runoff, requiring the
18 incorporation of on-site small drainages and pervious materials to retain absorption
19 and allow more percolation of stormwater into the ground, and encouraging the
20 construction of detention basins or holding ponds and/or constructed wetlands within
21 a project site to capture and treat dry weather urban runoff. The measure would
22 ensure that postdevelopment stormwater runoff flow rates do not differ from the
23 predevelopment stormwater runoff flow rates.

24 Determination: Implementation of the above regulations and mitigation measures would
25 ensure that the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of
26 existing facilities would occur as needed to serve new development and that the
27 environmental effects of such facilities would be reduced to a less than cumulatively
28 considerable level.

3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.17.5) Solid Waste Impacts

The proposed Project would accommodate future development of both high-density residential and mixed-use development that would generate solid waste to be disposed of in County landfills. If areas are fully built out, solid waste resulting from future development facilitated by the Project could hasten the end of the usable lives of County landfills and contribute to the cumulative need for new or expanded landfills and other solid waste facilities. Using Riverside County's residential solid waste generation factor of 0.41 tons per dwelling unit, the Project would generate 30,034 tons of waste per year beyond that already planned for by the General Plan (73,255 du x 0.41 tons per du = 30,034 tons).

Regulations: Standard Riverside County measures require that recycling facilities (enclosures, etc.) be provided for all new commercial and multifamily developments. Further, all plot plans are required to comply with the RCDWR's Design Guidelines for Refuse and Recyclables Collections and Loading Areas, as well as to submit a waste recycling plan for each building proposed. To verify AB 341 compliance for the recycling of construction and demolition (C&D) materials, the RCDWR requires that accurate records for both C&D recycling and solid waste disposal be kept. According to RCDWR procedures, County occupancy permits will not be cleared for issuance unless the required evidence (e.g., receipts) demonstrating appropriate waste recycling plan compliance is presented to the RCDWR. For residential, commercial, and industrial developments, as well as public facilities, other conditions of approval are added through issuance of a clearance letter by the RCDWR. The clearance letter outlines the additional project-specific requirements to ensure that individual project developers provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials, such as paper products, glass, and green wastes.

Mitigation: Mitigation measure 3.17.4 states, "The County of Riverside shall require all future commercial, industrial, and multifamily residential development to provide adequate areas for the collection and loading of recyclable materials (i.e., paper

1 products, glass, and other recyclables) in compliance with the State Model
2 Ordinance, implemented on September 1, 1994, in accordance with AB 1327,
3 Chapter 18, California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991.”

4 Mitigation measure 3.17.5 states, “The County of Riverside shall require all
5 development projects to coordinate with appropriate County departments and/or
6 agencies to ensure that there is adequate waste disposal capacity to meet the waste
7 disposal requirements of the Project. The County shall recommend that all
8 development projects incorporate measures to promote waste reduction, reuse,
9 recycling and composting.”

10 Determination: Landfills serving the County have a collective remaining capacity of
11 63,095,267 tons to serve future development resulting from the proposed Project
12 (refer to Table 3.17-2 in the Draft EIR). Solid waste generated by full buildout of the
13 proposed Project would represent 0.05 percent of this remaining capacity. This
14 represents full buildout of the proposed Project. Furthermore, these generation
15 assumptions do not consider the effects of compliance with mandatory recycling and
16 diversion programs, which would further reduce the amount of waste sent to landfills.
17 For these reasons, this impact would be reduced to a less than cumulatively
18 considerable level.

19 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following cumulative
20 environmental impacts associated with the Project cannot be fully mitigated and will be only partially
21 avoided or lessened with compliance with existing regulations or mitigation measures hereinafter specified
22 in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program which is incorporated herein by reference.
23 Accordingly, the County makes the following findings as to each of the following cumulative impacts as
24 allowed by State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a): “Changes or alterations [that might further reduce
25 Project impacts] are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the [County].
26 Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency”;
27 or “Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of
28 employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project

alternatives identified in the final EIR." Therefore, a statement of overriding considerations consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15093, 15126(b), and 15126.2(b) and discussed in the Final EIR Section 2.1 is required and included herein:

A. Air Quality

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.3.1) Conflicts with Air Quality Management Plan

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has drafted the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (2012 AQMP) in order to reduce emissions for which the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) is in nonattainment, and the Coachella Valley PM₁₀ State Implementation Plan (CVSIP), which establishes additional controls needed to demonstrate expeditious attainment of the PM₁₀ standards in the Coachella Valley, the Riverside County portion of the SSAB. These air quality attainment plans establish a program of rules and regulations directed at reducing air pollutant emissions and achieving state and national air quality standards. The proposed Project would allow for an increase in population growth that was not considered in the 2012 AQMP or considered in the CVSIP. In addition, future development under the proposed Project would result in long-term operational emissions.

Regulations: None applicable

Determination: While it is the intent for the Project to reduce vehicle miles traveled, it is not possible to determine if the market will respond or if residents will work and shop locally. Regardless of the planning intent, when considered collectively, the combined emissions from buildout of the proposed Project could exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants (refer to Table 3.3-5 on page 3.0-33 in the Draft EIR). Exceeding these thresholds would conflict with, and has the potential to hinder the region's compliance with, the 2012 AQMP and the CVSIP. There is no feasible mitigation available to reduce cumulative criteria pollutant impacts to below

regulatory thresholds. Thus, impacts associated with implementation of the Project would remain significant and unavoidable with respect to regional air quality plans.

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.3.2) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation

Subsequent land use activities associated with implementation of the proposed Project could result in short-term construction emissions; however, quantifying the specific amount of air quality pollutant emissions from future, short-term, temporary construction activities allowed under the proposed Project is not possible due to project-level variability and uncertainties related to future individual projects in terms of detailed site plans, construction schedules, equipment requirements, etc., which are not currently determined. However, depending on how development proceeds, construction-generated emissions associated with development could potentially exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance.

Regulations: Future development accommodated by the Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rules and General Plan policies that would contribute to reducing construction-related pollutant emissions, including, but not limited to: GPA 960 Policies AQ 1.1 and AQ 1.4 (RCIP GP Policies AQ 1.1 and AQ 1.4) which require both participation with the regional air districts to protect and improve air quality and coordination with regional air districts to ensure that all elements of air quality plans regarding reduction of air pollutant emissions are being enforced; GPA 960 Policy AQ 4.7 (RCIP GP Policy AQ 4.7), requires projects estimated to exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds to implement mitigation measures in order to reduce air pollutant emissions to the greatest extent possible; SCAQMD Rule 402 which prohibits the discharge from any source whatsoever of such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property;

1 and SCAQMD Rule 1113 which requires manufacturers, distributors, and end-users
2 of architectural and industrial maintenance coatings to reduce ROG emissions from
3 the use of paint, primarily by placing limits on the ROG content of various paint-
4 type categories.

5 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.3.1 states, "All individual, future development
6 instigated by the Housing Element are required to prepare an analyses of potential
7 air quality impacts in accordance with SCAQMD promulgated methodology
8 protocols. Projects estimated to exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds are
9 required, per GPA 960 Policy AQ 4.7 (RCIP GP Policy AQ 4.7), to implement
10 mitigation measures in order to reduce air pollutant emissions to the greatest extent
11 possible.

12 Mitigation measure MM 3.3.2 states, "Implement the following applicable Rule 403
13 measures:

- 14 • Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturer
15 specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas
16 inactive for 10 days or more).
- 17 • Water active sites at least twice daily. (Locations where grading is to occur
18 will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving.)
- 19 • All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered,
20 or should maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard in accordance with the
21 requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means
22 vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).
- 23 • Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from main road.
24 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less."

25 Mitigation measure MM 3.3.3 states, "Implement the following additional
26 SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook dust measures:

- 27 • Revegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

- All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- All streets shall be swept once a day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water).
- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.”

Mitigation measure MM 3.3.4 states, “Implement the following mitigation measures for construction equipment and vehicles exhaust emissions:

- The construction contractor shall select the construction equipment used on-site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer specifications.
- The construction contractor shall utilize electric- or diesel-powered equipment, in lieu of gasoline-powered engines, where feasible.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.
- The construction contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.

- Dust generated by the development activities shall be retained on-site and kept to a minimum by following the dust control measures listed below.
 - a. During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.
 - b. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the late morning, after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour.
 - c. Immediately after clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur.
 - d. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.
 - e. Trucks transporting soil, sand, cut or fill materials and/or construction debris to or from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin."

Mitigation measure MM 3.3.5 states, "The construction contractor shall ensure that all disturbed areas and stock piles are watered at least three times per day or soil stabilizers are applied as necessary to prevent visible dust plumes from these areas. Stock piles not in use may be covered with a tarp to eliminate the need for watering or other stabilizers."

Mitigation Measures MM 3.3.6 states "All construction equipment shall have EPA-rated engines of Tier 3 or better."

Mitigation Measures MM 3.3.7 states "As soon as electric utilities are available at construction sites, the construction site shall be supplied with electricity from the

1 local utility and all equipment that can be electrically operated shall use the electric
2 utility rather than portable generators.”

3 Determination: In addition to site-specific mitigation that would be determined on a project-
4 by-project basis, existing Riverside County practices, SCAQMD and MDAQMD
5 rules, would reduce construction-related impacts by reducing air pollutant emissions
6 from construction activities. However, even where such measures would reduce an
7 individual project’s emissions to less than significant levels, none of the measures
8 herein serve to prevent individual actions from being constructed concurrently, and
9 thus, resulting in cumulatively significant impacts. Additionally, neither the amount
10 of construction occurring nor the exact location within the County is foreseeable;
11 thus, it cannot be determined if the resultant construction emissions could be
12 adequately controlled or reduced to below regulatory thresholds. Without such
13 information, it is not possible to conclude that air pollutant emissions resulting from
14 construction activities would be adequately reduced and, therefore, this impact must
15 be assumed to remain significant and unavoidable.

16 3. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.3.3) Cause Significant Operational (Long-
17 Term) Air Emissions

18 At buildout, the proposed Project would result in a maximum net increase of
19 approximately 2,667 pounds per day (lbs/day) of ROG, 2,455 lbs/day of NO_x, 2,181
20 lbs/day of PM₁₀, and 705 lbs/day of PM_{2.5}. Even assuming the most conservative
21 land use potential and the construction and operation of every potential site would
22 result in emissions in excess of SCAQMD thresholds for criteria air pollutants and
23 precursors (refer to Table 3.3-5 on page 3.0-33 in the Draft EIR).

24 Regulations: Future development accommodated by the Project would be required to comply
25 with SCAQMD Rules and General Plan policies that would contribute to reducing
26 long-term air emissions, including, but not limited to: GPA 960 Policy AQ 4.7 (RCIP
27 GP Policy AQ 4.7), which requires the implementation of mitigation measures for
28 all projects which exceed allowable emissions as established by air districts in order

1 to reduce air pollutant emissions to the greatest extent possible; General Plan air
2 quality-related policy provisions that promote a reduction in air pollutant emissions
3 by shortening commute distances and encouraging the use of alternate modes of
4 transportation, and promote the use of renewable energy sources such as geothermal
5 for heating; General Plan strategies that establish a transit-supportive environment
6 by improving connections between stations and adjacent destinations, densifying and
7 intensifying land uses at key locations in the County, and enhancing the physical
8 design of the urban environment; Riverside County Ordinances No. 706, 726, 782,
9 and 824 which minimize impacts to air quality through the reduction of motor
10 vehicle emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled and vehicle idling times and by
11 increasing vehicle fuel efficiencies.

12 Mitigation: Mitigation Measures MM 3.3.8 states, "All new development shall ensure that
13 all interior and exterior architectural coatings used are low in reactive organic gases."
14 Mitigation Measures MM 3.3.9 states, "If hearths are included in new residential
15 developments, they shall be energy-efficient natural gas appliances. No wood-
16 burning hearths or stoves shall be permitted in new residential developments."

17 Determination: Even after compliance with applicable General Plan policies and SCAQMD
18 Rules, significance thresholds are projected to be exceeded when considering the
19 cumulative emissions resulting from buildout of the proposed Project. Therefore, this
20 is considered a cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable impact.
21 While this would result in a significant and unavoidable impact, it should be noted
22 that the values used for the analysis of the project assume the entire project would be
23 built out under the provided density. While this is technically feasible, it would be
24 unlikely that the proposed project would be developed at the maximum density at
25 full buildout.

26 4. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.3.4) Result in a cumulatively considerable
27 net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment
28 under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard

1 By its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. No single project is
2 sufficient in size, by itself, to result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards.
3 Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively
4 significant adverse air quality impacts. If a project's individual emissions exceed its
5 identified significance thresholds, then that project would be cumulatively
6 considerable. Projects that do not exceed significance thresholds would not be
7 considered cumulatively considerable. As discussed previously, the proposed Project
8 could result in significance thresholds being exceeded when considering the
9 cumulative emissions resulting from buildout of the proposed Project.

10 Regulations: Future development accommodated by the Project would be required to comply
11 with regulations that would contribute to reducing cumulative increases in emissions
12 of criteria air pollutants, including, but not limited to: General Plan Policy AQ 4.7;
13 and Riverside County Ordinances No. 706, 726, 782, and 824. Future development
14 allowed under the Housing Element would be required to adhere to these regulatory
15 measures intended to minimize impacts to air quality.

16 Mitigation: None feasible.

17 Determination: There is no feasible mitigation to reduce the impact to a less than significant
18 level. As such, impacts would remain cumulatively considerable and significant and
19 unavoidable.

20 B. Greenhouse Gases

- 21 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.7.1) Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions,
22 either Directly or Indirectly, that may have a Significant Impact on the Environment;
23 Conflict with an applicable Plan, Policy or Regulation Adopter for the Purpose of
24 Reducing the Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

25 Development accommodated under the proposed Project would result in direct
26 emissions of GHGs from construction activities and operations. Quantifying the
27 specific GHG emissions from future, short-term, temporary construction activities
28 allowed under the proposed Project is not possible due to project-level variability

1 and uncertainties related to future individual projects in terms of detailed site plans,
2 construction schedules, equipment requirements, etc., none of which have yet been
3 determined. Buildout of the Project would result in a maximum net increase of
4 approximately 529,779 metric tons of CO₂e in the year 2020 and 498,410 metric tons
5 of CO₂e in the year 2035, from Project operations (refer to Table 3.7-3 in the Draft
6 EIR). These emissions could potentially conflict with an applicable plan adopted for
7 the purpose of reducing GHG emissions or substantially contribute to global
8 greenhouse gas emissions.

9 Regulations: The SCAQMD's GHG emission plan-level threshold is 6.6 metric tons of
10 CO₂e per service population (residents plus employees) per year by the year 2020
11 and 4.1 metric tons of CO₂e per service population per year by the year 2035. The
12 SCAQMD's approach is to identify the emissions level for which a project would
13 not be expected to substantially conflict with existing California legislation adopted
14 to reduce statewide GHG emissions.

15 Mitigation: None feasible.

16 Determination: Future development under the proposed Project would cumulatively result
17 in 240,805 more people in comparison to buildout of the adopted General Plan.
18 Dividing the GHG emissions for each time period yields a metric ton per service
19 population ratio of 2.2 for year 2020 conditions and 2.0 for year 2035 conditions
20 (refer to Table 3.7-4 in the Draft EIR). While this would not surpass the year 2020
21 or year 2035 significance thresholds, quantifying the specific GHG emissions from
22 future, short-term, temporary construction activities allowed under the proposed
23 Project is not possible due to project-level variability and uncertainties related to
24 future individual projects in terms of detailed site plans, construction schedules,
25 equipment requirements, etc., none of which have yet been determined. Future
26 project-level analyses of GHG emissions-related impacts, in accordance with
27 SCAQMD requirements, would be conducted on a case-by-case basis as individual,
28 future development projects proceed. While the SCAQMD has promulgated

methodology protocols for the preparation of GHG analyses, and future development projects allowed under the Project that are projected to exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds are required to implement mitigation measures in order to reduce GHG emissions as much as feasible, SCAQMD significance thresholds may still be exceeded. Since it cannot be guaranteed that construction of future projects would generate GHG emissions below SCAQMD significance thresholds due to the programmatic and conceptual nature of the proposed Project and uncertainties related to future individual projects, this is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

C. Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.9.2) *Substantially Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere Substantially with Groundwater Recharge such that there would be a Net Deficit in Aquifer Volume or a Lowering of the Local Groundwater Table Level*

The increase in density/intensity potential resulting from the Project would accommodate increased population and development throughout the unincorporated County in comparison to conditions anticipated under the General Plan, potentially resulting in increased water demands on areas relying on groundwater supplies. This is particularly likely in areas of Riverside County where new development would rely solely on groundwater for supply. At the Countywide level, increased water demand could lead to groundwater extractions cumulatively exceeding groundwater basins' safe yields or causing a net deficit in aquifer volume.

Regulations: GPA 960 Policy OS 2.2 (RCIP GP Policy OS 2.2) encourages the installation of water-conserving systems, such as dry wells and graywater systems, in new developments. Riverside County Ordinance No. 859, Water-Efficient Landscape Requirements, requires new development projects to install water-efficient landscapes, thus limiting water applications and reducing water use. Decreasing irrigation water use would assist in decreasing drawdown of groundwater basins. In addition, the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requires the

1 creation of groundwater sustainability agencies to develop and implement local plans
2 that include measurable objectives for groundwater basins to achieve sustainability
3 in a 20-year time frame.

4 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.9.5 states, "Riverside County shall enforce
5 compliance with federal, state, and local standards for water conservation within
6 residential, commercial, or industrial projects. Prior to approval of any development
7 within the County of Riverside, the applicant shall submit evidence to Riverside
8 County that all applicable water conservation measures have been met."

9 Determination: While some of the groundwater basins supplying water to Riverside County
10 have been adjudicated and are actively managed for hydrologic balance, others
11 remain unadjudicated with no determination of safe yield and no current plan for
12 long-term basin management to ensure that overdraft does not occur. In addition, it
13 is uncertain exactly what portion of the water supply for future development would
14 be provided by groundwater, as the source of the water supply (groundwater, surface
15 water, recycled water, imported water, etc.) would vary depending on the ultimate
16 timing and location of development. Given the uncertainty of future groundwater
17 extractions and the hydrologic balance of groundwater basins in the County, there
18 continues to be a risk of overdraft (particularly in the nonadjudicated groundwater
19 basins in Riverside County) as demand for water increases. The combination of
20 increased demand for water associated with the growth facilitated by the Project,
21 unpredictability and the cost of imported water supply, variability in long-term
22 supply scenarios in nonadjudicated basins, exploitation of new groundwater sources,
23 and the continuing pattern of basin overdraft would all result in or contribute
24 incrementally to substantially decreasing groundwater supplies. This
25 unpredictability and variability mean that significant impacts associated with project
26 buildout cannot be ruled out. Implementation of the SGMA would reduce the
27 unpredictability and variability in long-term water supply scenarios for areas of the
28 County receiving water supplies from currently unadjudicated groundwater basins

1 that are identified as high or medium priority basins. However, these plans are not
2 currently in place. Although compliance with County regulations and mitigation
3 measure MM 3.9.5 would ensure the incorporation of feasible water conservation
4 features, given the unpredictability and variability of water supplies and groundwater
5 management as described, significant impacts associated could still occur. As a
6 result, this impact is considered cumulatively considerable and significant and
7 unavoidable.

8 D. Noise

- 9 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.12.1) *Exposure of Persons to or Generation*
10 *of Noise Levels in Excess of Standards Established in the Local General Plan or*
11 *Noise Ordinance, or Applicable Standards of Other Agencies; A Substantial*
12 *Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels in the Project Vicinity above Levels*
13 *Existing without the Project*

14 Future high density and mixed-use development accommodated by the Project would
15 result in the introduction of new noise-sensitive land uses into areas of existing
16 excess noise or areas in which cumulative County growth would eventually lead to
17 excess noise levels. In addition, future development accommodated by the Project
18 would contribute incrementally to increased traffic volumes on Riverside County
19 roads, resulting in noise increases affecting sensitive land uses along existing and
20 future roads. As a result, new development, particularly high density uses along and
21 adjacent to major transit corridors, could be exposed to noise levels that exceed
22 Riverside County's noise standards. Existing sensitive uses would also be subject to
23 these higher noise levels.

24 Regulations: Riverside County standards specify that proposed new noise-sensitive uses
25 must be sited, designed, and/or engineered to ensure that the interior and exterior
26 exposure standards are not exceeded (GPA 960 Policies N 1.3, 14.1 [RCIP Policy N
27 13.1], 14.9 [RCIP Policy N 13.9], N 4.1, and LU 16.10 [RCIP Policy LU 15.10]).
28

1 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.12.1 states, “All new residential developments in
2 Riverside County shall conform to a noise exposure standard of 65 dBA L_{dn} for
3 outdoor noise in noise-sensitive outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA L_{dn} for indoor
4 noise in bedrooms and living/family rooms. New development that does not and
5 cannot be made to conform to this standard shall not be permitted.”

6 Mitigation measure MM 3.12.2 states, “Acoustical studies, describing how the
7 exterior and interior noise standards will be met, shall be required for all new
8 residential developments with a noise exposure greater than 65 dBA L_{dn}. The studies
9 shall also satisfy the requirements set forth in Title 24, Part 2 of the California
10 Building Code (Noise Insulation Standards), for multiple-family attached homes,
11 hotels, motels, etc. No development permits or approval of land use applications shall
12 be issued until an acoustic analysis is received and approved by the Riverside County
13 Planning Department.”

14 Mitigation measure MM 3.12.3 states, “Acoustical studies shall be required for all
15 new noise-sensitive projects that may be affected by existing noise from stationary
16 sources.”

17 Mitigation measure MM 3.12.4 states, “To permit new development of residential
18 and noise-sensitive land uses where existing stationary noise sources exceed
19 Riverside County’s noise standards, effective mitigation measures shall be
20 implemented to reduce noise exposure to or below the allowable levels of the zoning
21 code/noise control ordinance.”

22 Determination: For new development instigated by the proposed Project, it is anticipated
23 that Riverside County standards could be met and substantial noise impacts could be
24 avoided by incorporating appropriate mitigation strategies which would reduce
25 potential impacts to less than significant levels. However, for existing noise-sensitive
26 uses located in areas adjacent to SR 111 between 65th and 68th Avenues, it may not
27 be possible or feasible to include noise reduction strategies to address noise impacts.
28 The County of Riverside cannot demonstrate at this time that County noise policy

provisions would reduce impacts on this segment of SR 111 (see Table 3.12-1 in the Draft EIR). Although future project-level analyses of noise impacts would determine whether there are any feasible mitigation measures that could be applied in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level based on the specific design parameters of future development proposals, it cannot be guaranteed that future projects allowed under the Project would be able to implement feasible mitigation to reduce noise levels on SR 111 between 65th Avenue and 68th Avenue to levels below County standards due to the programmatic and conceptual nature of the proposed Project and uncertainties related to future individual projects. Therefore, this is considered a cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable impact.

E. Population and Housing

2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.13.1) *Induce Substantial Population Growth in an Area, either Directly or Indirectly*

The Project includes changes to HHDR and MUA land use designations and zone classifications on approximately 4,972 acres of land, which would result in an increase in density/intensity potential on those sites and would therefore have the potential to result in more housing units and population in the unincorporated County as a whole. Based on theoretical buildout projections of land use designations included in the proposed Project, future development under the proposed Project would cumulatively result in the capacity for up to 73,255 more dwelling units and 240,805 more people in comparison to buildout of the adopted General Plan, a 16 percent increase (refer to Tables 3.13-3 and 3.13-4 in the Draft EIR). In addition, revisions included in the proposed Project in order to adopt and implement the new HHDR and MUA land use designations and zone classifications would allow such development to be proposed in other areas throughout the County (with the processing of a General Plan Amendment and/or change in zone classification). While these would not directly result in development activities, they are intended to encourage growth in the form of multifamily development in the County.

1 Regulations: State housing element law includes statutory recognition that in order for the
2 private sector to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments
3 must adopt land-use plans and regulatory schemes which provide opportunities for
4 and do not unduly constrain housing development. Therefore, housing elements by
5 nature are designed to encourage housing development and the intent of the Project
6 is to update the County's Housing Element for the 2013–2021 planning period
7 consistent with state housing element law. The Project is also intended to
8 demonstrate that Riverside County has sufficient land with the appropriate land use
9 designation and zoning necessary for the private sector to meet the housing needs of
10 population growth already anticipated in the County as determined by the 5th cycle
11 RHNA Allocation Plan, which covers the planning period from October 2013 to
12 October 2021 and was adopted by SCAG on October 4, 2012. Given the variety of
13 environmental and other factors that are affected by such growth, most of the policies
14 in the General Plan directly or indirectly address aspects of these issues. The Vision
15 chapter summarizes the General Plan's approach to population growth by stating,
16 "Growth focus in Riverside County is on quality, not on frustrating efforts to halt
17 growth" and "Population growth continues and is focused where it can best be
18 accommodated". These statements indicate that population growth is anticipated in
19 the County and that the General Plan policies and programs intend to ensure the
20 quality of such growth rather than to prevent it.

21 Mitigation: None feasible.

22 Determination: The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan Vision chapter in
23 that it provides opportunities to implement the County's housing goals with respect
24 to meeting the needs of existing and future residents, including accommodating the
25 development of a variety of housing types, styles, and densities. Generally, the sites
26 included in the proposed Project are located along major transportation corridors
27 and/or on sites in the vicinity of future urban development and public service/utility
28 infrastructure anticipated by the County's General Plan. However, substantial

1 population growth would occur if a specific General Plan land use designation
2 change (or new or revised plans/policies) resulted in an increase in population
3 beyond that already planned for and accommodated by the existing General Plan,
4 cause a growth rate in excess of that forecast in the existing General Plan, or do either
5 of these relative to existing regional plans, such as the SCAG Regional
6 Transportation Plan. Because the increased density/intensity capacity resulting from
7 the Project could increase growth beyond that already planned for and
8 accommodated by the General Plan, growth resulting from the Project on a
9 countywide level would be considered substantial. Since the Project is designed to
10 accommodate additional affordable housing development, limiting or otherwise
11 reducing the amount of growth resulting from the Project would contradict its
12 purpose. For these reasons, this impact is considered to be cumulatively considerable
13 and significant and unavoidable.

14 F. Transportation/Traffic

15 1. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.16.1) Increased Traffic Volumes On
16 Regional Arterial Roadway Segments

17 Under buildout of the proposed Project, traffic volumes would be reduced on three
18 regional arterial roadway segments in comparison to buildout of the existing General
19 Plan land uses. However, the addition of project-related traffic would increase traffic
20 volumes on all other regional arterial roadway segments already projected to operate
21 at an unacceptable level (LOS F)(refer to Table 3.16-1 in the Draft EIR).

22 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy C 2.2 requires new development to prepare a traffic impact
23 analysis as warranted by the Riverside County Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation
24 Guidelines or as approved by the Director of Transportation. The Riverside County
25 Transportation Department requires that the traffic and circulation impacts of
26 proposed development projects be analyzed through the preparation of a Traffic
27 Impact Analysis prepared in conformance with Transportation Department
28 requirements. The Traffic Impact Analysis must be prepared, signed, and sealed by

1 a traffic engineer or a civil engineer registered in the state of California, qualified to
2 practice traffic engineering.

3 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.16.1 states, "As part of its review of land development
4 proposals, the County of Riverside shall require project proponents to make a fair
5 share contribution to required intersection and/or roadway improvements. The
6 required intersection and/or roadway improvements shall be based on maintaining
7 the appropriate level of service (LOS D or better). The fair share contribution shall
8 be based on the percentage of project-related traffic to the total future traffic."

9 Mitigation measures MM 3.16.2 states, "As part of its review of land development
10 proposals, the County of Riverside shall ensure sufficient right-of-way is reserved
11 on critical roadways and at critical intersections to implement the approach lane
12 geometrics necessary to provide the appropriate levels of services."

13 Determination: Regional arterials are already projected to operate at LOS F under buildout
14 of existing General Plan land use designations, which limit the ability to require new
15 projects to solve the existing level of service issue. Because funding associated with
16 existing traffic is uncertain, the added increase in traffic volume resulting from future
17 development associated with the increase in density/intensity potential resulting from
18 the Project would remain cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.

19 G. Utilities and Service Systems

20 2. Cumulative Impacts: (Impact Analysis 3.17.2) *Water Supply Demand*

21 The proposed Project would accommodate increased density/intensity throughout
22 the unincorporated County, which has the potential to increase demands on existing
23 water supplies, entitlements, and infrastructure. Using the average potable water
24 demand for a residential unit in Riverside County of 1.01 acre-feet per year, future
25 development from the Project could result in the cumulative demand for up to 73,987
26 acre-feet per year of water demand beyond that anticipated under buildout of the
27 approved General Plan. At the Countywide level, full buildout of the Project would
28 have the potential to result in demand for water supplies where such are insufficient

1 or unavailable to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, thus
2 necessitating new or expanded entitlements in order to adequately serve future
3 development, or result in development in locations in which water supply adequacy
4 cannot be ascertained.

5 Regulations: Compliance with the following county water management and conservation
6 regulations and General Plan policies would assist in reducing the amount of water
7 supplies required by future development: GPA 960 Policy OS 2.2 (RCIP GP Policy
8 2.1), which encourages the installation of water-conserving systems, such as dry
9 wells and graywater systems, in new developments; GPA 960 Policies LU 18.1
10 through 18.4 (no similar RCIP GP Policies) and Ordinance No. 859, Water-Efficient
11 Landscape Requirements, which require new development projects to install water-
12 efficient landscapes, thus limiting water applications and reducing water use.

13 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.17.3 states, "Development within unincorporated
14 areas of Riverside County shall not use water of any source of quality suitable for
15 potable domestic use for nonpotable uses, including cemeteries, golf courses, parks,
16 highway landscaped areas, industrial and irrigation uses, or other nondomestic use if
17 suitable recycled water is available as provided in Sections 13550-13566 of the
18 California Water Code and/or PRC Sections 65591-65600 and 65601-65607. Prior
19 to the issuance of any land use permit, the County shall determine to what extent and
20 in which manner the use of recycled water is required for individual water projects.
21 Future development shall be designed, constructed, and maintained in accordance
22 with the recycled water measures mandated by the County."

23 Mitigation measure MM 3.9.5 as discussed under the finding for Impact Analysis
24 3.9.2 requires an applicant for development to submit evidence to Riverside County
25 that all applicable water conservation measures have been met.

26 Determination: Much of the County receives water from the State Water Project (SWP),
27 supplies of which are constrained by key factors such as rainfall amounts, snowpack
28 and stored water levels, and pumping capacity from the Delta, as well as legal and

1 regulatory factors including those related to certain fish species listed as endangered
2 by the state and federal governments. Inconsistencies in rainfall and snowpack, as
3 well as frequently changing regulatory restrictions, mean that the availability of
4 future SWP water supplies is to some degree uncertain. Similarly, the year-to-year
5 availability of Colorado River water (the other primary source of imported water
6 supply utilized in Riverside County) to urban users can be variable and unpredictable
7 because of legal challenges regarding water rights and priorities. Therefore,
8 regardless of the above mitigations and regulation, in the absence of definitive
9 identification of future water supplies for buildout associated with the Project,
10 potential impacts associated with water supply and demand must be considered
11 cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following localized
13 environmental impacts foreseeable in connection to project-related changes to the Land Use Element's Area
14 Plans provided in the Project's General Plan Amendment No. 1122 are determined to be less than significant
15 with compliance with existing regulations:

16 1. Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

17 A. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Substantially Damage Scenic Resources Within a State
18 Scenic Highway

19 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.2); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
20 Analysis 4.2.2); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.2);
21 Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.2); and Lakeview/Nuevo
22 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.2).

23 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP GP Policy LU 4.1); GPA 960 Policy LU 14.3
24 (RCIP GP Policy LU 15.3); GPA 960 Policy 14.4 (RCIP GP Policy LU 15.4); GPA
25 960 Policies OS 22.1 and OS 22.4 (RCIP GP Policies OS 22.1 and OS 22.4); Elsinore
26 Area Plan Policy ELAP 10.1; Mead Valley Area Plan Policy MVAP 10.1; Western
27 Coachella Valley Area Plan Policy WCVAP 19.1; and Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan
28 Policy LNAP 11.1.

1 Determination: Compliance with County General Plan policies would ensure that future
2 development would preserve scenic resources along scenic corridors and would not
3 detract from scenic qualities as viewed from any highway. As a result, impacts would
4 be considered less than significant for the Elsinore Area Plan; the Mead Valley Area
5 Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; and
6 Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan.

7 B. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *New Sources of Substantial Light and Glare*

8 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.4); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
9 Analysis 4.2.4); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.3); Highgrove
10 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.3); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact
11 Analysis 4.5.3); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.3); Western Coachella
12 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.4); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
13 (Impact Analysis 4.8.4); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.4); The
14 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.3).

15 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP GP Policy LU 4.1); Riverside County
16 Ordinance No. 915, Regulating Outdoor Lighting; Riverside County Ordinance No.
17 655, Regulating Light Pollution; Elsinore Area Plan Policy ELAP 7.1; Mead Valley
18 Area Plan Policy MVAP 8.1; Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan Policy HVWAP
19 9.1; Southwest Area Plan Policy SWAP 13.3; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan
20 Policy WCVAP 16.2; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan Policy ECVAP 4.2;
21 Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan Policy LNAP 8.1; and The Pass Area Plan Policy PAP
22 9.1.

23 Determination: Compliance with County policies and regulations would ensure that new
24 sources of lighting resulting from future development associated with the Project
25 would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area and would not
26 adversely affect the Palomar Observatory by addressing standards for development
27 within 15 to 45 miles of the Palomar Observatory, regulating light trespass in areas
28 that fall outside of the 45-mile radius, and requiring new development to mitigate

lighting impacts on surrounding properties. As a result, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

B. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Conflicts with Agricultural Zoning*

Impacts: Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.5); Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.4); and Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.4).

Regulations: None applicable

Determination: The Project proposes amendments to Ordinance No. 348, the Riverside County Land Use Ordinance, to apply the new mixed-use zone classification and R-7 zone classification to sites currently zoned for agricultural uses in the Mead Valley Area Plan, Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan; and Southwest Area Plan. Although the Project would change the zoning from agricultural to accommodate multi-family residential uses, the current land use designation of the sites proposed for changes is residential. Therefore, it is the intent of GPA 960 and the 2003 RCIP GP that the proposed neighborhood sites be developed with residential land uses; this intended rezoning of agricultural land to residential land has been evaluated for environmental effects in the General Plan EIR and EIR No. 441. The proposed Project would therefore not result in an impact beyond that already analyzed. As a result, impacts would be considered less than significant for the Mead Valley Area Plan, Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan; and Southwest Area Plan.

C. Biological Resources

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Substantial Adverse Effect on Special-Status Species*

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.5); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.6); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.4); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.4); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact

1 Analysis 4.5.5); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.5); Western Coachella
2 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.5); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
3 (Impact Analysis 4.8.7); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.5); The
4 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.4).

5 Regulations: Requirements of the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat
6 Conservation Plan (WRC-MSHCP) or the Coachella Valley Multiple Species
7 Habitat Conservation Plan (CV-MSHCP). Riverside County Ordinances No. 810 and
8 No. 875 require land use projects within the coverage areas of those plans to pay a
9 development impact fee to establish reserves and implement the respective
10 conservation plans. Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 requires development
11 projects within the Stephens' kangaroo rat HCP area to pay a development mitigation
12 fee to establish the reserves, administer the plan, and otherwise meet the
13 requirements of this HCP. GPA 960 Policy OS 17.2 (RCIP GP Policy OS 17.1)
14 requires the enforcement of the provisions of applicable MSHCPs when conducting
15 review of development applications.

16 Determination: All of the neighborhood sites are located within the boundaries of the WRC-
17 MSHCP or the CV-MSHCP, both of which provide for the protection of sensitive
18 species by designating a contiguous system of habitat to be added to existing
19 public/quasi-public lands. Review for site-specific requirements under the MSHCPs,
20 as well as payment of required development mitigation fees, would occur at the time
21 future development of the neighborhood sites is proposed. Payment of the mitigation
22 fee and compliance with the requirements of the MSHCPs is intended to provide full
23 mitigation under CEQA, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), federal
24 Endangered Species Act (ESA), and California Endangered Species Act (CESA) for
25 impacts to the species and habitats covered by the MSHCPs. As a result, impacts
26 would be reduced to a less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead
27 Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest
28 Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area

Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Adverse Effects To Movement, Migration, Wildlife Corridors, and the Use of Native Wildlife Nursery Sites

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.7); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.8); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.6); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.6); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.7); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.7); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.7); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.9); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.7); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.6).

Regulations: Requirements of the WRC-MSHCP or CV-MSHCP

Determination: Impacts to wildlife movement associated with development are mitigated due to corridors and linkages established by the MSHCPs, which established Conservation Areas and articulate objectives and measures for the preservation of core habitat and the biological corridors and linkages needed to maintain essential ecological processes. In addition, the MSHCPs protect native wildlife nursery sites by conserving large blocks of representative native habitats suitable for supporting species' life-cycle requirements and the essential ecological processes of species that depend on such habitats. Review for site-specific requirements under the applicable MSHCP, as well as payment of the development mitigation fee, would occur at the time future development of the neighborhood sites is proposed. With payment of the mitigation fee and compliance with the requirements of the applicable MSHCP, impacts would be considered less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area

Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

3. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan*

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.8); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.9); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.7); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.7); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.8); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.8); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.8); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.10); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.8); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.7).

Regulations: Requirements of the WRC-MSHCP or CV-MSHCP

Determination: Future development accommodated by the proposed Project would be required, through Riverside County standard conditions of approval, to comply with review for site-specific requirements under the applicable MSHCP, as well as payment of the development mitigation fees. With payment of the mitigation fee and compliance with any site-specific requirements, future development projects would be in compliance with the WRC-MSHCP or CV-MSHCP, as well as with CEQA, NEPA, CESA and FESA. For this reason, impacts would be considered less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

D. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Airport Conflicts*

Impacts: Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.9); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.9); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.9).

Regulations: GPA 960 Policies LU 15.1, 15.2, 15.7, 15.8, 15.9, and 31.2 (RCIP GP Policies 14.1, 14.2, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, and 25.2); Hemet-Ryan Airport Land Use Compatibility

Plan (ALUCP); March Joint Air Reserve Base ALUCP; French Valley ALUCP; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan Policies HVWAP 1.1 and HVWAP 2.1; Southwest Area Plan Policy SWAP 11.1; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan Policy LNAP 3.1.

Determination: Compliance with ALUCP compatibility requirements, along with County General Plan policies, would ensure that future development proposals on the neighborhood sites would be subject to review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission and that regulations governing such issues as development intensity, density, and height of structures would be enforced so that the increase in density/intensity potential on the neighborhood sites would not result in an airport-related safety hazard. For this reason, impacts would be considered less than significant level for the Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; and Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan.

2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Wildfire Hazards

Impacts: Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.10)

Regulations: California Fire Code

Determination: In consideration of the proposed Project resulting in residential development within existing city limits, the size of the community and number of existing fire stations, compliance with the California Fire Code, and the existing urban characteristics, development allowed under the proposed Project will not result in a significant risk of exposure of individuals or structures to the threat of wildfire. For this reason, impacts would be considered less than significant level for the Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan.

///

///

///

///

///

1 E. Hydrology and Water Quality

2 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Dam Inundation*

3 Impacts: Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.8).

4 Regulations: Temescal Canyon Area Plan Policy TCAP 20.2 and TCAP 20.4; Riverside
5 County Ordinance No. 458, Regulating Flood Hazard Areas.

6 Determination: Compliance with Riverside County Ordinance No. 458 and Temescal
7 Canyon Area Plan policies would ensure that risks associated with development in
8 dam failure inundation zones and other areas potentially prone to flooding or
9 inundation hazards due to failure of a flood control facility would be reduced via
10 review by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and
11 management of flood flows to prevent hazards or undue risk of damage or harm to
12 people, property, structures, and facilities. For this reason, impacts would be
13 considered less than significant level for the Temescal Canyon Area Plan.

14 F. Land Use and Planning

15 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Conflicts with Land Use Plans*

16 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.9); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
17 Analysis 4.2.12); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.9); Highgrove
18 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.10); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact
19 Analysis 4.5.11); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.11); Western Coachella
20 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.9); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
21 (Impact Analysis 4.8.12); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.11); The
22 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.8).

23 Regulations: None applicable

24 Determination: Project-related changes affecting each Area Plan are intended to support the
25 overall objective of bringing the Housing Element into compliance with state
26 housing law and to meet a statutory update requirement, as well as to help the County
27 meet its state-mandated RHNA obligations. As the Area Plans are extensions of the
28 County of Riverside General Plan, and the proposed Project would implement and

enhance, rather than conflict with, the land use plans, policies, and programs of the remainder of the General Plan, changes to Area Plans would not conflict with the County's General Plan or any other plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. For this reason, impacts would be considered less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

G. Noise

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Airport-Related Noise Impacts*

Impacts: Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.15); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.13); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.13); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.14); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.14).

Regulations: GPA 960 Policy N 1.7 (RCIP GP Policy N 1.7), N 2.2 (RCIP GP N 2.2), N 7.1 (RCIP GP N 7.1), N 7.4 (RCIP GP Policy N 7.4), N 19.3 (RCIP GP N 18.3); Riverside County ALUCP.

Determination: Future development would be required to comply with applicable airport land use noise compatibility criteria. In addition, the above policies and regulations would ensure that an acoustical study would be performed in areas impacted by airport noise in order to determine the necessary site design and building construction to achieve acceptable interior and exterior noise exposure levels for habitable structures. For this reason, impacts would be considered less than significant for the Mead Valley Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; and Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan.

H. Population and Housing

Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Induce Substantial Population Growth*

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.12).

1 Regulations: GPA 960 Housing Element Policies 1.1 and 1.2 (RCIP GP Housing Element
2 Policies 1.1 and 1.2)

3 Determination: The Project would increase the potential for high density housing in the
4 Elsinore area consistent with specific Housing Element policies intended to
5 encourage the provision of affordable housing. Furthermore, the neighborhood sites
6 are all currently designated/classified for urban development and located in the
7 vicinity existing public service and utility infrastructure. By directing growth to
8 existing urban areas and reviewing each development proposal impacts to services,
9 the County will ensure that future development meets demand through application
10 of mitigation measures, conditions of approval, and impact fee programs. For these
11 reasons, the increase in housing and population growth that could occur on the
12 neighborhood sites and in the surrounding Elsinore area as a result of the Project
13 would not be considered substantial and impacts would be considered less than
14 significant for the Elsinore Area Plan.

15 I. Public Services

16 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services*

17 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.13); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
18 Analysis 4.2.17); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.13); Highgrove
19 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.15); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact
20 Analysis 4.5.14); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.16); Western Coachella
21 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.13); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
22 (Impact Analysis 4.8.16); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.16); The
23 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.12).

24 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy LU 5.1 (RCIP GP Policy LU 5.1), Policy S 5.1 (RCIP GP
25 Policy S 5.1), Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Establishing Development
26 Impact Fees; Riverside County Ordinance 787; California Building and Fire Codes.

27 Determination: Future development on the neighborhood sites would be required to
28 contribute its fair share to fund fire facilities via fire protection mitigation fees,

1 construction of any Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) facilities would be
2 subject to CEQA review, and compliance with existing regulations would reduce the
3 impacts of providing fire protection services. For these reasons, impacts associated
4 with the provision of fire protection and emergency services would be less than
5 significant for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon
6 Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest
7 Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area
8 Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

9 2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Law Enforcement Services

10 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.14); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
11 Analysis 4.2.18); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.14); Highgrove
12 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.16); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact
13 Analysis 4.5.15); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.17); Western Coachella
14 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.14); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
15 (Impact Analysis 4.8.17); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.17); The
16 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.13).

17 Regulations: Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Establishing Development Impact Fees.

18 Determination: Future development on the neighborhood sites would fund additional officers
19 through property taxes and any facilities needed to accommodate the personnel would
20 be subject to CEQA review. For these reasons, impacts associated with the provision
21 of law enforcement services would be less than significant for the Elsinore Area Plan;
22 Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest
23 Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area
24 Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass
25 Area Plan.

26 2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Public School Facilities

27 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.15); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
28 Analysis 4.2.19); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.15); Highgrove

Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.17); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.16); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.18); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.15); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.18); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.18); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.14).

Regulations: Development mitigation fees pursuant to Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act (SB 50).

Determination: Pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act (SB 50), future development would be required to pay residential and commercial/industrial development mitigation fees to fund school construction. In order to obtain a building permit, the County requires the applicant to obtain a Certificate of Compliance from the applicable school district verifying that developer fees have been paid. Under CEQA, payment of development fees is considered to provide full mitigation for the impact of the proposed Project on public schools. For these reasons, impacts to schools would be less than significant for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

J. Recreation

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Parks and Recreation

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.16); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.20); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.16); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.18); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.17); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.19); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.16); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.19); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.19); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.15).

1 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy OS 20.5 (RCIP GP Policy OS 20.5), Policy OS 20.6 (RCIP
2 GP Policy OS 20.6); Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Establishing
3 Development Impact Fees.

4 Determination: Existing General Plan policies and development fees, along with the
5 County's development review process, would ensure that future development
6 facilitated by the increase in density/intensity potential would provide for adequate
7 park and recreation facilities. The construction/development of these park and
8 recreation facilities would be subject to CEQA review. For these reasons, park and
9 recreation impacts would be less than significant for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead
10 Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest
11 Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area
12 Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass
13 Area Plan.

14 K. Utilities and Service Systems

15 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Increased Demand for Wastewater Services*

16 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.18); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
17 Analysis 4.2.22); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.18); Southwest
18 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.21); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact
19 Analysis 4.7.18); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.21);
20 Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.21).

21 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy LU 22.2; Riverside County Ordinance No. 592, Regulating
22 Sewer Use, Sewer Construction and Industrial Wastewater Discharges in County
23 Service Areas; Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Establishing Development
24 Impact Fees.

25 Determination: The need for wastewater facilities/capacity to serve specific development
26 proposals will be determined through the development review process with any
27 necessary infrastructure improvements required as project conditions of approval.
28 Additionally, Ordinance No. 659, DIF Program, is intended to mitigate growth impacts

1 in Riverside County by ensuring fees are collected and expended to provide necessary
2 facilities commensurate with the ongoing levels of development. This would include
3 any potential future expansion wastewater treatment facilities. For these reasons,
4 increased demands for wastewater services impacts would be less than significant
5 for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan;
6 Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella
7 Valley Area Plan; and the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan.

8 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following localized
9 environmental impacts foreseeable in connection to project-related changes to the Land Use Element's Area
10 Plans provided in the Project's General Plan Amendment No. 1122 are potentially significant unless
11 otherwise indicated, but each of these impacts will be avoided or substantially lessened to a level of less
12 than significant by the identified existing regulations or mitigation measures specified in the attached
13 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Accordingly, the County makes the following finding as to
14 each of the following impacts pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a): "Changes or alterations
15 have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant
16 environmental effect as identified in the final EIR."

17 A. Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

18 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Substantial Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista

19 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.1); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
20 Analysis 4.2.1); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.1); Highgrove
21 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.1); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact
22 Analysis 4.5.1); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.1); Western Coachella
23 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.1); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
24 (Impact Analysis 4.8.1); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.1); The
25 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.1).

26 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP GP Policy LU 4.1); GPA 960 Policy LU 14.8
27 (RCIP GP Policy LU 13.8)
28

1 Mitigation: Mitigation Measure MM 3.1.1 as discussed under the Finding for Impact 3.1.1
2 states “Development projects shall be subject to the requirements of all relevant
3 guidelines, including the community center guidelines, Riverside County
4 supervisorial district guidelines and all applicable standards, policies, and/or
5 regulations of the County of Riverside or other affected entities pertaining to scenic
6 vistas and aesthetic resources. Factors considered in these guidelines include the
7 scale, extent, height, bulk or intensity of development; the location of development;
8 the type, style and intensity of adjacent land uses; the manner and method of
9 construction, including materials, coatings, and landscaping; the interim and/or final
10 use of the development; the type, location, and manner of illumination and signage;
11 the nature and extent of terrain modification required; and the potential effects to the
12 established visual characteristic of the Project site and identified scenic vista or
13 aesthetic resource.”

14 Determination: Compliance with County General Plan policies and mitigation measure MM
15 3.1.1 would ensure that future development facilitated by the Project would be
16 located and designed to visually enhance and not degrade the character of the
17 surrounding area and to consider various factors during the development review
18 process, several of which would protect scenic vistas, including the scale, extent,
19 height, bulk, or intensity of development; the location of development; the type,
20 style, and intensity of adjacent land uses; the manner and method of construction; the
21 type, location, and manner of illumination and signage; the nature and extent of
22 terrain modification required; and the potential effects to the established visual
23 characteristic of the Project site and identified scenic vistas or aesthetic resources.
24 As a result, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level for the Elsinore
25 Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area
26 Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western
27 Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo
28 Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Substantially Degrade Existing Visual Character*

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.3); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.3); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.2); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.2); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.2); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.2); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.3); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.3); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.3); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.2).

Regulations: GPA 960 Policy LU 4.1 (RCIP GP Policy LU 4.1); GPA 960 Policy LU 14.8 (RCIP GP Policy LU 13.8); Mead Valley Area Plan Policy MVAP 8.1; Highgrove Area Plan Policy HAP 1.1; Highgrove Area Plan Policy HAP 1.3; Southwest Area Plan Policy SWAP 16.1; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan Policy WCVAP 8.6; The Pass Area Plan Policy PAP 5.25; Countywide Design Standards and Guidelines; Mecca Design Guidelines; Lakeview/Nuevo Design Guidelines; and Oak Tree Management Guidelines.

Mitigation: Mitigation Measure MM 3.1.1

Determination: Existing County policies and design guidelines, as well as implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.1.1 and the proposed policies for MUA-designated areas, would reduce aesthetic impacts by ensuring that future development is designed to be compatible with the surrounding uses and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the neighborhood sites. As a result, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

///

///

1 B. Biological Resources

2 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Impacts On Riparian Habitats, Sensitive Natural*
3 *Communities, and/or Federally Protected Wetlands*

4 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.6); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
5 Analysis 4.2.7); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.5); Highgrove
6 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.5); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact
7 Analysis 4.5.6); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.6); Western Coachella
8 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.6); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
9 (Impact Analysis 4.8.8); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.6); The
10 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.5).

11 Regulations: Requirements of the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat
12 Conservation Plan (WRC-MSHCP) or the Coachella Valley Multiple Species
13 Habitat Conservation Plan (CV-MSHCP); Clean Water Act (CWA) and U.S. Army
14 Corps of Engineers protocol (CWA Section 404 permit); California Fish and Game
15 Code Section 1600 et seq. (Section 1601 or 1603 permit and Streambed Alteration
16 Agreement);

17 Mitigation: Mitigation Measures MM 3.4.5 and MM 3.4.6

18 Determination: All of the neighborhood sites are located within the boundaries of the WRC-
19 MSHCP or the CV-MSHCP, both of which are designed to ensure conservation of
20 covered species as well as the natural communities on which they depend, including
21 riparian habitat and other sensitive habitats. In addition, future development under
22 the Project would be required to comply with the above regulatory actions governing
23 riparian and wetland resources, as well as mitigation measures MM 3.4.5 and MM
24 3.4.6, which require an appropriate assessment to be prepared by a qualified
25 professional as part of Riverside County's project review process if site conditions
26 (for example, topography, soils, vegetation) indicate that the proposed Project could
27 affect riparian/riverine areas or federally protected wetlands. As a result, impacts
28 would be reduced to a less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead

Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

C. Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: 100-Year Flood Hazards

Impacts: Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.11); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.9); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.10); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.11); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.10).

Regulations: GPA 960 Policy S 4.1 (RCIP GP Policy S 4.1); S 4.2 (RCIP GP Policy S 4.2); Policy S 4.3 (RCIP GP S 4.3); S 4.4 (RCIP GP Policy S 4.4); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan ECVAP Policy 18.1; ECVAP Policy 18.2; Riverside County Ordinance No. 458, Regulating Flood Hazard Areas.

Mitigation: Mitigation Measures MM 3.9.15 through MM 3.9.17

Determination: The specifications, standards, and requirements contained in Ordinance No. 458 establish and implement measures that mitigate potential flood hazards in Riverside County, and mitigation measures MM 3.9.15 through MM 3.9.17 would ensure that structures are adequately flood-proofed so that people and property are not exposed to significant 100-year flood hazards and future development would not significantly impede or redirect flood flows. As a result, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level for the Mead Valley Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; and Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan.

D. Utilities and Service Systems

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Increased Demand for Water Supply and Services

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.19); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.23); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.19); Highgrove

Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.21); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.20); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.22); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.22); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.22).

Regulations: GPA 960 Policy OS 2.2 (RCIP GP Policy OS 2.1); Ordinance No. 859, Water-Efficient Landscape Requirements; Riverside County Ordinance No. 659, Establishing Development Impact Fees.

Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.9.5.

Determination: Compliance with County- and state-required water management and conservation regulations would assist in reducing the amount of water supplies required by future development on the neighborhood sites. In addition, mitigation and review by the water district would ensure that future development is not approved without adequate water supplies. Finally, water supplies in the following Area Plans can accommodate future demand required by residential development on the neighborhood sites. As a result, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; and the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan.

2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.20); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.24); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.20); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.22); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.21); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.23); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.22); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.23); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.23); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.19).

1 Regulations: RCDWR's Design Guidelines for Refuse and Recyclables Collection and
2 Loading Areas; mandatory commercial and multi-family recycling requirements of
3 Assembly Bill 341.

4 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.17.4 and MM 3.17.5.

5 Determination: There is adequate capacity at existing landfills to serve future development
6 resulting from the increase in density/intensity potential on the neighborhood sites
7 and future development would be required to meet County and state recycling
8 requirements to further reduce demands on area landfills. As a result, impacts would
9 be reduced to a less than significant level for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley
10 Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-
11 Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan;
12 Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area
13 Plan.

14 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the following localized
15 environmental impacts foreseeable in connection to project-related changes to the Land Use Element's Area
16 Plans and associated with the Project's General Plan Amendment No. 1122 cannot be fully mitigated and
17 will be only partially avoided or lessened with compliance with existing regulations or mitigation measures
18 hereinafter specified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Accordingly, the
19 County makes the following findings as to each of the following impacts as allowed by State CEQA
20 Guidelines section 15091(a): "Changes or alterations [that might further reduce Project impacts] are within
21 the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the [County]. Such changes have been
22 adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency"; or "Specific economic,
23 legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for
24 highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final
25 EIR." Therefore, a statement of overriding considerations consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section
26 15093, 15126(b), and 15126.2(b) and discussed in the Final EIR Section 6.0 is required and included herein:

27 A. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

28 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Conversion of Farmland*

1 Impacts: Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.5)

2 Regulations: Riverside County Ordinance No. 625, Right-to-Farm Ordinance.

3 Mitigation: None feasible.

4 Determination: The proposed neighborhood sites include approximately 472 acres of Prime
5 Farmland and 52 acres of existing agricultural land that is a mixture of Prime
6 Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, Urban
7 and Built-Up Land, and lands designated as “Other” lands. Although the proposed
8 Project does not include site-specific development proposals or entitlements,
9 changing the land use designations and zone classifications would result in increased
10 development potential and would facilitate the future development of residential and
11 mixed-use development on the sites. In addition, the Project could encourage
12 additional conversion of adjacent farmland via the extension of roadways or public
13 service/utility infrastructure into an undeveloped area. Riverside County Ordinance
14 625 protects existing agricultural uses from nuisance complaints. However, given
15 that full buildout of the neighborhood sites would result in the direct conversion of
16 over 472 acres of Important Farmland within the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
17 planning area, there is no mitigation feasible to reduce this impact to a less than
18 significant level. As a result, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for
19 the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan.

20 2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Conflicts with Agricultural Zoning*

21 Impacts: Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.6)

22 Regulations: Riverside County Ordinance No. 625, Right-to-Farm Ordinance.

23 Mitigation: None feasible.

24 Determination: The proposed Project would rezone approximately 525 acres of land in
25 the Mecca Town Center and Oasis Town Center communities that are currently
26 designated/zoned for agriculture uses. Riverside County Ordinance 625 protects existing
27 agricultural uses from nuisance complaints. While this would ensure that future
28 development would mitigate impacts to surrounding farmland to the greatest extent

feasible, the loss of agriculturally zoned lands under the proposed Project would still result in impacts due to conflicts with existing agricultural zoning. As a result, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan.

B. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Airport Hazards*

Impacts: Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.10)

Regulations: GPA 960 Policy LU 15.2 (RCIP GP Policy LU 14.2); GPA 960 Policy LU 15.7 (RCIP GP Policy LU 14.5); Mead Valley Area Plan Policy MVAP 2.1; March Air Reserve Base Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).

Mitigation: None feasible.

Determination: According to the March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Criteria, residential density less than or equal to than 6.0 dwelling units per acre (i.e., an average parcel size less than 0.2 gross acres) is permitted in Compatibility Zone C2 (Flight Corridor Zone). Additionally, building height limit in Zone C2 is set at a maximum of 70 feet. Neighborhoods 1 and 2 in the Mead Valley Community area are located in Zone C2 and the Project would facilitate the future development of high-density residential development and mixed-use development incorporating high-density residential development. Although compliance with the ALUCP, along with General Plan policies, would ensure that the increase in density/intensity potential on the neighborhood sites would not result in an airport-related safety hazard, density requirements for neighborhoods 1 and 2 in the Mead Valley Community area are restricted to six dwelling units or less per acre and the density requirements for these neighborhoods would not be met. There is no feasible mitigation to reduce this impact and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for the Mead Valley Area Plan.

///

///

///

C. Noise

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Noise Levels In Excess of Standards

Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.10); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.13); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.10); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.11); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.12); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.12); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.10); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.13); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.12); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.9).

Regulations: GPA 960 Policies N 1.1 through N 1.5 (RCIP GP Policies N 1.1 through N 1.5); Policy N 9.3 (RCIP GP Policy N 8.3); N 9.7 (RCIP GP Policy N 8.7); and Policy N 11.5 (RCIP GP Policy N 10.5); Riverside County Ordinance No. 847, Regulating Noise.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures MM 3.12.1, MM 3.12.2, MM 3.12.3, and MM 3.12.4.

Determination: The above requirements and mitigation would ensure that new development is sited, designed, and/or engineered to include the necessary setbacks, construction materials, sound walls, berms, or other features necessary to ensure that internal and external noise levels meet the applicable County standards. Existing sensitive uses, particularly residences, however, would also be subject to project-related traffic noise increases. It is possible that full mitigation of noise impacts to existing uses resulting from traffic increases would be infeasible due to cost or design obstacles associated with redesigning or retrofitting existing buildings or sites for sound attenuation. As noise mitigation practices/design cannot be guaranteed for reducing project-related noise exposure to existing uses, particularly from roadway noise or other noises generated outside of the neighborhood sites, noise impacts are considered significant and unavoidable for the Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan;

1 Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area
2 Plan.

3 2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Substantial Permanent Increase In Ambient Noise
4 Levels

5 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.11); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
6 Analysis 4.2.14); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.11); Highgrove
7 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.12); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact
8 Analysis 4.5.12); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.13); Western Coachella
9 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.11); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
10 (Impact Analysis 4.8.14); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.13); The
11 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.10).

12 Regulations: GPA 960 Policies N 1.1 through N 1.5 (RCIP GP Policies N 1.1 through N
13 1.5); Policy N 9.3 (RCIP GP Policy N 8.3); N 9.7 (RCIP GP Policy N 8.7); and Policy
14 N 11.5 (RCIP GP Policy N 10.5); Riverside County Ordinance No. 847, Regulating
15 Noise.

16 Mitigation: None feasible.

17 Determination: Although future development facilitated by the Project would increase
18 ambient noise levels via stationary noise sources (HVAC units, motors, appliances,
19 lawn and garden equipment, etc.) and through the generation of additional traffic
20 volumes area roadways, the above requirements would ensure that the noise levels
21 at new development meets the applicable County standards. However, as discussed
22 under the finding for “Noise Levels In Excess of Standards” it is possible that full
23 mitigation of noise impacts to existing uses resulting from traffic increases would be
24 infeasible due to cost or design obstacles associated with redesigning or retrofitting
25 existing buildings or sites for sound attenuation. As noise mitigation practices/design
26 cannot be guaranteed for reducing project-related noise exposure to existing uses,
27 particularly from roadway noise or other noises generated outside of the
28 neighborhood sites, noise impacts are considered significant and unavoidable for the

Elsinore Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

D. Population and Housing

1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Induce Substantial Population Growth

Impacts: Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.2.16); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.12); Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.14); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.13); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.15); Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.12); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.8.15); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.15); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.11).

Mitigation: None feasible.

Determination: The Project would increase the potential for high density housing in the Area Plans consistent with specific Housing Element policies intended to encourage the provision of affordable housing. Furthermore, the neighborhood sites are all currently designated/classified for urban development and located in the vicinity of existing public service and utility infrastructure. By directing growth to existing urban areas and reviewing each development proposal impacts to services, the County will ensure that future development meets demand through application of mitigation measures, conditions of approval, and impact fee programs. However, the change in land use designation and zone classification would result in increases in population and housing growth beyond conditions anticipated for buildout of the neighborhood sites under the current land use designations. This may encourage additional growth, with new nonresidential and employment development occurring to serve new residents. Future development could result in the need for additional public services and utility infrastructure, such as new or expanded roadways, schools,

1 parks, and public safety facilities, in addition to the need for additional water,
2 wastewater, and other utility infrastructure. As the increased density/intensity
3 capacity resulting from the Project could increase growth at the local Area Plan level
4 beyond that already planned for and accommodated by the General Plan, growth
5 resulting from the Project on a local level would be considered substantial. As the
6 Project is designed to accommodate additional affordable housing development,
7 limiting or otherwise reducing the amount of growth resulting from the Project would
8 contradict its purpose. For these reasons, the increase in housing and population
9 growth that could occur on the neighborhood sites would remain significant and
10 unavoidable for the Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove
11 Area Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western
12 Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo
13 Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

14 E. Transportation/Traffic

15 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Adverse Traffic Impacts*

16 Impacts: Elsinore Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.1.17); Mead Valley Area Plan (Impact
17 Analysis 4.2.21); Temescal Canyon Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.3.17); Highgrove
18 Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.19); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan (Impact
19 Analysis 4.5.18); Southwest Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.6.20); Western Coachella
20 Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.17); Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan
21 (Impact Analysis 4.8.20); Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.9.20); The
22 Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.16).

23 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy C 2.5 (RCIP GP Policy C 2.5).

24 Mitigation: None feasible.

25 Determination: Each future development project on the neighborhood sites would be
26 required to prepare a focused traffic impact analyses addressing site- and project-
27 specific traffic impacts and to make a "fair share" contribution to required
28 intersection and/or roadway improvements or to contribute appropriate development

1 impact fees. As GPA 960 Policy C 2.5 (RCIP GP Policy C 2.5) states that cumulative
2 and indirect traffic impacts of development may be mitigated through the payment
3 of impact mitigation fees, traffic impacts resulting from future development would
4 be mitigated to the greatest extent feasible. However, the Project would contribute
5 traffic to roadways already projected to operate at unacceptable LOS under buildout
6 of existing General Plan land use designations, which limits the ability to require new
7 projects to solve the existing LOS issue. Because funding associated with existing
8 traffic is uncertain, the added increase in traffic volume resulting from future
9 development associated with the increase in density/intensity potential on the
10 neighborhood sites would therefore be significant and unavoidable for the Elsinore
11 Area Plan; Mead Valley Area Plan; Temescal Canyon Area Plan; Highgrove Area
12 Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; Southwest Area Plan; Western
13 Coachella Valley Area Plan; Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan; Lakeview/Nuevo
14 Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

15 F. Utilities and Service Systems

16 1. Localized Area Plan Impacts: Increased Demand for Wastewater Services – Septic
17 Tanks and Alternative Systems

18 Impacts: Highgrove Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.4.20); Harvest Valley-Winchester Area
19 Plan (Impact Analysis 4.5.19); The Pass Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.10.17).

20 Regulations: County Code Section 8.124.030; Riverside County Ordinance No. 650,
21 Regulating the Discharge of Sewage in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of
22 Riverside; US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) septic system standards.

23 Mitigation: Mitigation measures MM 3.17.1 and MM 3.17.2.

24 Determination: The County regulates the construction of septic tanks in new development
25 to ensure both adequate capacity for wastewater treatment and the protection of water
26 quality and the above regulations address that the type of sewage facilities installed
27 shall be determined on the basis of location, soil porosity, site slope, and ground
28 water level, and shall be designed to receive all sanitary sewage from the property

1 based on the higher volume estimation as determined by either the number of
2 bedrooms or plumbing fixture unit counts. However, the majority of the proposed
3 neighborhood sites are less than the 0.50 acre minimum lot size required for
4 structures utilizing an OWTS. Additionally, given the density/intensity of future
5 development potentially occurring in association with the Project, it is likely that the
6 provision of adequate capacity for wastewater treatment would require community
7 OWTS, alternate systems, or infrastructure improvements beyond those anticipated
8 for buildout of the neighborhood sites under current land use designations. The
9 feasibility of such systems is dependent on the specifics of the development proposal
10 and property-specific conditions that cannot be determined at this time. For these
11 reasons, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for the Highgrove Area
12 Plan; Harvest Valley-Winchester Area Plan; and The Pass Area Plan.

13 2. Localized Area Plan Impacts: *Increased Demand for Water Supply and Service*

14 Impacts: Western Coachella Valley Area Plan (Impact Analysis 4.7.19); The Pass Area Plan
15 (Impact Analysis 4.10.18).

16 Regulations: GPA 960 Policy OS 2.2 (RCIP GP Policy OS 2.1); Ordinance No. 859, Water-
17 Efficient Landscape Requirements; Riverside County Ordinance No. 659,
18 Establishing Development Impact Fees.

19 Mitigation: Mitigation measure MM 3.9.5.

20 Determination: Although compliance with water conservation regulations, mitigation, and
21 review by the water district will ensure that future development is not approved
22 without adequate water supplies and the incorporation of feasible water conservation
23 features, adequate water supplies for all potential future development associated with
24 the Project cannot be assured at this time. As a result, this impact is considered
25 significant and unavoidable for the Western Coachella Valley Area Plan and The
26 Pass Area Plan.

27 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has considered the following
28 alternatives identified in EIR No. 548 in light of the environmental impacts which cannot be avoided or

1 substantially lessened and has rejected those alternatives as failing to meet most of the Project's objectives,
2 as failing to reduce or avoid the Project's significant impacts or as infeasible for the reasons hereinafter
3 stated:

4 Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and the State CEQA Guidelines section
5 15126.6(a), an EIR must assess a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project action or location. Section
6 15126.6(a) places emphasis on focusing the discussion on alternatives which provide opportunities for
7 eliminating any significant adverse environmental impacts, or reducing them to a level of insignificance,
8 even if these alternative would impede to some degree the attainment of the Project objectives, or would
9 be more costly. In this regard, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the
10 other alternatives. As with cumulative impacts, the discussion of alternatives is governed by the "rule of
11 reason". The EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained, or does
12 not contribute to an informed decision-making and public participation process. The range of alternatives
13 is defined by those alternatives, which could feasibly attain the objectives of the Project. As directed, in
14 State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(c), an EIR shall include alternatives to the Project that could
15 feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the Project.

16 A. The Project has been developed to achieve the following goals:

- 17 1. Adopt a Riverside County 2013–2021 Housing Element acceptable to the California
18 Department of Housing and Community Development.
- 19 2. Continue directing housing and service development to Area Plans and existing
20 services.
- 21 3. Adopt amendments to the Land Use and Safety Elements of the General Plan in
22 support of the revised Housing Element and to reflect state law.
- 23 4. Adopt an ordinance amendment to add new zoning classifications to implement the
24 updates to the County's General Plan provided in General Plan Amendment No.
25 1122.
- 26 5. Rezone property consistent with the changes to the Housing and Land Use Elements
27 as necessary to meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- 28 6. Emphasize development potential near transit corridors and existing infrastructure.

1 As directed in State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(c), an EIR shall include alternatives to the
2 Project that could avoid or substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects. Because not all
3 significant effects can be substantially reduced to a less than significant level either by adoption of
4 mitigation measures, Project Design Features, existing regulations or by standard conditions of approval,
5 the following section considers the feasibility of the Project alternatives as compared to the proposed
6 Project. As explained below, these findings describe and reject, for reasons documented in the Final
7 Program EIR No. 548 and summarized below, each one of the Project alternatives. The evidence supporting
8 these findings is presented in Section 6.0, "Alternatives Analysis" of the Draft EIR and elsewhere in the
9 administrative record as a whole.

10 A. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

11 Future development allowed under the 2013–2021 Housing Element update would
12 cumulatively result in the capacity for up to 73,254 more dwelling units and 240,805 more
13 people in Riverside County in comparison to the development capacity without the 2013–
14 2021 Housing Element. The No Project Alternative assumes that the 2013–2021 Housing
15 Element update is not adopted. In addition, the proposed changes to the Land Use Element
16 and Ordinance No. 348, and the redesignation and rezoning of specific sites throughout the
17 unincorporated County, would not occur. Accordingly, Alternative 1 can also be said to
18 represent the "status quo." However, the status quo in this case equates to the continual lack
19 of accommodation of the previous 2006–2013 RHNA, as well as not accommodating the
20 most recent, 2014–2021 RHNA. This is in conflict with Government Code Section 65583
21 requirements that jurisdictions evaluate their housing elements every eight years to
22 determine their effectiveness in achieving county and state housing goals and objectives, and
23 adopt an updated housing element reflecting the results of this evaluation. Although all of
24 the Project's significant impacts are lessened under this alternative, this Alternative would
25 not satisfy the stated objectives of the Project.

26 Thus, this alternative is not deemed the favored means for achieving the stated project
27 objectives and, for these reasons, the No Project Alternative is not deemed the preferred
28 alternative.

1 B. Alternative 2 - Remove All Lands Designated for Agricultural Land Use

2 The proposed Project would rezone approximately 525 acres of land in the Eastern Coachella
3 Valley Area Plan that are currently both designated and zoned for agriculture uses. Of those,
4 approximately 472 acres are Prime Farmland, with the remaining 52 acres being a mixture
5 of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance,
6 Urban and Built-Up Land, and lands designated as 'Other' lands. While other property may
7 be similarly designated, the existing General Plan and the previous General Plan designated
8 the properties for development and made findings of overriding considerations addressing
9 the conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural purposes. The proposed Project would
10 add an additional 131.48 acres of agricultural land that was not previously designated for
11 development. This additional agricultural land conversion is considered a significant and
12 unavoidable impact. Alternative 2 would eliminate the significant impact by removing the
13 131.48 acres identified for redesignation to nonagricultural purposes. The reduction of
14 131.48 acres would result in the potential for 4,154 fewer housing units and 19,418 fewer
15 residents than shown in Table 4.8-8 of the Draft EIR. This is a reduction of approximately
16 17 percent from the potential units and population estimated.

17 Alternative 2 would remove the 131.48 acres from the proposed Project which would
18 eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact. In this regard, Alternative 2 would have a
19 less of an impact on agricultural resources than the proposed Project.

20 In terms of the Project's stated objectives, this alternative would reduce the total acreage of
21 the proposed Project by approximately 17%, or 131.48 acres. Due to this reduction, the
22 Project would not meet a number of objectives, including adoption of an updated Housing
23 Element and consistency with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) as the
24 Project site would be reduced below the state required RHNA acreages.

25 Although an improvement over the Project in some ways, specifically agricultural lands, this
26 alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project as it would still
27 have similar impacts to the Project for Hazards and Noise. Impacts to the above listed impact
28 areas would remain largely the same as those evaluated under the proposed Project.

Thus, this alternative is not an acceptable means for achieving the stated Project objectives. For all of these reasons, the Alternative 2 is not deemed the preferred alternative.

C. Alternative 3 - Remove HHDR on All Lands Affected by MARB Land Use

On August 17, 2015, the County received a letter from Edward Cooper from the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). This letter states that the 50 percent Highest Density Residential (HHDR) for both Neighborhoods 1 and 2 are inconsistent with the provisions of the 2014 March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port ALUC Plan. According to the plan, these neighborhoods are located in Airport Compatibility Zone C2, where residential densities are limited to a maximum of six dwelling units per acre. Further, because these neighborhoods are within an airport compatibility zone, they are subject to mandatory ALUC review. The only alternative that would address this potential impact is to reduce density to six dwellings per acre. The two neighborhoods total approximately 88 acres and with a 50 percent proposed HHDR designation represent a potential for 1,320 housing units. Housing could still be permitted in the area subject to the six or fewer units per acre restriction of the Airport Compatibility Zone C-2; however, at this density, the housing would be considered market rate. Alternative 3 would remove the HHDR expectation for the two neighborhoods, which would eliminate any conflict with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

This alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative due to the reduction in impacts related to noise, traffic and transportation, and hazards/hazardous materials. The removal of the site from the ALUC Zone C2 would eliminate a significant unavoidable impact associated with hazards.

In terms of the Project's stated objectives, this alternative would not preclude the Project from meeting the Project objectives; however, it would lower the proposed number of acres anticipated to be included to meet the RHNA. The removal of the neighborhoods within the MARB ALUC Zone 2 would require the removal of all of the proposed HHDR/MUA neighborhoods and would result in a reduced number of units within the MVAP.

1 Thus, this alternative is not an acceptable means for achieving the stated Project objectives.

2 For all of these reasons, the Alternative 3 is not deemed the preferred alternative.

3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has, pursuant to State CEQA
4 Guidelines section 15093, balanced the benefits of the Project against the significant and unavoidable
5 adverse environmental effects described herein, and has determined that each and every one of the following
6 benefits individually outweigh and render acceptable each and every one of those significant environmental
7 effects. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that EIR No. 548 has identified and discussed significant
8 effects that may occur as a result of the Project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures
9 discussed in EIR No. 548, these impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant except for the
10 unavoidable and significant impacts discussed in the findings herein. The Board of Supervisors further finds
11 that except for the Project, all other alternatives set forth in EIR No. 548 are infeasible because they would
12 prohibit the realization of the Project objectives and/or specific economic, social or other benefits that the
13 Board finds outweigh any environmental benefits of the alternatives.

14 The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that, having reduced the adverse significant
15 environmental effects of the Project, to the extent feasible by adopting the proposed mitigation measures,
16 having considered the entire administrative record on the Project and having weighed the benefits of the
17 Project against its unavoidable significant impacts after mitigation, the Board has determined that the social,
18 economic and environmental benefits of the Project outweigh the potential unavoidable significant impacts
19 and render those potential significant impacts acceptable based upon the following considerations.

- 20 • The Riverside County General Plan is intended to be a blueprint for Riverside
21 County's future. It describes the future growth and development within Riverside
22 County over the long-term. GPA No. 1122 was designed to provide an update to the
23 existing General Plan Housing Element policies, maps and implementing directions
24 in order to maintain required consistency within the General Plan.
- 25 • GPA No. 1122 provides required updates to the Riverside County General Plan in
26 order to fulfill the mandated requirements of the State of California Department of
27 Housing and Community Development, allowing for the development of new
28

1 affordable housing units distributed throughout the County for the benefits of
2 existing and future residents.

- 3 • The GPA No. 1122 updates will provide guidance for the expenditure of grant funds
4 received from the state and federal government and allows the County to be eligible
5 for grants linked to the updated Housing Element.
- 6 • The Project rezones property in order to be consistent with the changes required
7 under the General Plan Housing and Land Use Elements, in order to meet the State's
8 required Regional Housings Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- 9 • GPA No. 1122, as part of the required updated in housing mandated from the state,
10 emphasizes development potential near transit corridors and existing infrastructure.

11 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the State CEQA Guidelines
12 section 15126 (g) require an EIR to discuss how a proposed project could directly or indirectly lead to
13 economic, population, or housing growth. A project may be growth-inducing if it removes obstacles to
14 growth, taxes community service facilities or encourages other activities which cause significant
15 environmental effects. The discussion is provided in Section 6.0 of EIR No. 548, on pages 6.0-1 and 6.0-2,
16 and is summarized as follows:

17 Adoption of the proposed Project would not result in direct physical growth as it does not include
18 development proposals or grant site-specific development entitlement. However, the nature and purpose of
19 the proposed Project is inherently growth-inducing as it is intended to facilitate and encourage affordable
20 housing development throughout the County in order to comply with state law. The County's General Plan
21 indicates that population growth is anticipated in the County and that the intent of the General Plan policies
22 and programs is to ensure the quality of such growth rather than to prevent it. The Project is consistent with
23 the General Plan, and the sites facilitating density/intensity increases as a result of the proposed Project are
24 generally located along major transportation corridors and/or on sites in the vicinity of future urban
25 development and public service/utility infrastructure anticipated by the County's General Plan in order to
26 facilitate growth where it can be best accommodated. Therefore, it is unlikely that the proposed Project
27 would result in growth or intensification of development or sprawl in the surrounding region. Even so, the
28 Project would increase density/intensity capacity on sites throughout the County, which could increase

1 growth beyond that already planned for and accommodated by the General Plan, thus resulting in substantial
2 growth effects. Future development facilitated by the Project would be subject to all policies, plans,
3 procedures, and standards in the Riverside County General Plan, as well as federal and state regulations,
4 that collectively serve to mitigate and reduce, where possible, the severity of the environmental effects
5 associated with growth and buildout of Riverside County.

6 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Final EIR also discusses,
7 pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15126(c) and 15126.2(c), significant irreversible environmental
8 changes and provided in Section 6.0 of EIR No. 548, on pages 6.0-2 through 6.0-4.

9 With regard to the commitment of non-renewable resources (resources that comes from the earth
10 and cannot be readily replenished within the human timescale, including but not limited to, mineral
11 resources, particularly aggregate and metal ores, and fossil energy resources, such as oil, coal and natural
12 gas), pages 6.0-2 and 6.0-3 state "Adoption of the proposed Project does not include development proposals
13 in that it neither requires the construction of housing nor grants site-specific development entitlement.
14 However, the proposed Project is intended to encourage the future development of affordable housing at
15 high densities throughout the County. Although future construction and operation of future development
16 facilitated by the Project could result in the use of mineral and fossil energy resources, no refineries, large-
17 scale manufactories, or large-scale infrastructure development (hydroelectric dams, nuclear reactors,
18 wastewater treatment facilities, canals, interstate freeways, etc.) or other massive structures (skyscrapers,
19 penitentiaries, etc.) which would necessitate the commitment of large amounts of aggregates, including
20 rock, sand, gravel, cement, or other minerals, would occur or be required. Furthermore, any use of mineral
21 and fossil energy resources in association with future development would occur incrementally
22 commensurate with the growth rate, which is dependent on economic factors, market forces, and regulatory
23 restrictions. As such, the proposed Project would not necessitate a large commitment of nonrenewable
24 resources in a manner that makes their later removal or nonuse unlikely, and would not result in a significant
25 irreversible change in the environment due to the use of nonrenewable resources."

26 In addition, page 6.0-3 states that, "Future development accommodated by the Project would require
27 the consumption of fossil fuels (oil and other petroleum products) during both construction and operation,
28 as well as a result of increased vehicular use, which represents the largest source of fossil fuel use in the

1 County. Even so, the residential and mixed-use development facilitated by the Project is intended to
2 encourage housing development in order to comply with state law and, as such, would meet the housing
3 needs of population growth already anticipated in the County as determined by the 5th cycle RHNA plan.
4 The County's General Plan indicates that population growth is anticipated in the County and that the intent
5 of the General Plan policies and programs is to ensure the quality of such growth rather than to prevent it.
6 Therefore, the use of nonrenewable energy sources associated with future development would not be
7 considered 'unjustified.' Furthermore, the sites facilitating density/intensity increases as a result of the
8 proposed Project are generally located along major transportation corridors and/or on sites in the vicinity
9 of future urban development and public service/utility infrastructure anticipated by the County's General
10 Plan. Therefore, the growth pattern encouraged by the Project would ensure that energy resources
11 (renewable and nonrenewable) would be used in an efficient and non-wasteful manner. For these reasons,
12 it is anticipated that the Project would not result in the unjustified consumption of nonrenewable resources
13 and would not cause a significant irreversible environmental change as a result."

14 Another aspect of significant irreversible change is committing future generations to similar uses.
15 Pages 6.0-3 and 6.0-4 state that "the sites facilitating density/intensity increases as a result of the proposed
16 Project are generally located along major transportation corridors and/or on sites in the vicinity of future
17 urban development and public service/utility infrastructure anticipated by the County's General Plan. The
18 majority of sites proposed for land use changes are currently designated/classified for urban development
19 by GPA 960. In these instances, the proposed changes would not cause new impacts due to the commitment
20 of future generations to similar (urban) uses. However, as described above, the Project would induce growth
21 in the County. The exact scope, timing, and location of future off-site infrastructure improvements needed
22 to serve future development is not currently known. It is possible that the Project could lead either to
23 irreversible change in the middle of vacant, undeveloped land with intact native vegetation and other natural
24 resources, and possibly require further disturbances to provide access, water, sewer collection, and other
25 infrastructure, or would represent the extension of an existing general pattern of land use (typically rural or
26 agricultural) into natural open space located on the border between developing areas and natural open space.
27 Therefore, the Project would represent significant irreversible changes in the environment and commit
28 future generations to perpetuating the developed uses that would result."

1 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Project is consistent with the
2 applicable elements of the Riverside County General Plan as follows:

3 The proposed Project includes updates to multiple sections of the General Plan to maintain
4 consistency between the General Plan Elements. The Housing Element has been updated pursuant to State
5 of California Housing and Community Development standards. Further, the General Plan Land Use
6 Element (including Area Plans) and Safety Element were updated to maintain consistency with the proposed
7 updates to the Housing Element. All relevant figures and summary tables have also been updated to reflect
8 the changes made in the Housing Element. Further, the appendices to the General Plan have been updated
9 where appropriate to provide updated data to support the General Plan amendments.

10 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that the Project is consistent with the
11 Riverside County General Plan.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it has reviewed and considered
13 EIR No. 548 in evaluating the Project, that EIR No. 548 is an accurate and objective statement that complies
14 with CEQA and reflects the County's independent judgment, and that EIR No. 548 is incorporated herein
15 by this reference.

16 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that it ADOPTS the statement of
17 overriding considerations, CERTIFIES EIR No. 548, and ADOPTS the Mitigation Monitoring and
18 Reporting Plan (MMRP) attached as Attachment A hereto. To the extent that there are inconsistencies
19 between the mitigation measures set forth in EIR No. 548 and those set forth in the Mitigation and
20 Monitoring Plan, the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall control.

21 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors that copies of the Project shall be
22 placed on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Board and the County Planning Department and that the
23 custodians of the documents upon which this decision is based are the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
24 and the County Planning Department and that such documents are located at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside,
25 California.

26 ROLL CALL:

27 Ayes: Tavaglione, Washington and Ashley

28 Nays: Jeffries

 Absent: Benoit

The foregoing is certified to be a true copy of a
resolution duly adopted by said Board of Super-
visors on the date therein set forth.

KECIA HAPPEL, Clerk of said Board

By  Deputy

**RESOLUTION NO. 2016-234
AMENDING THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY
GENERAL PLAN
(Third Cycle General Plan Amendments for 2016)**

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65350 et seq., public hearings were held before the Riverside County Board of Supervisors and the Riverside County Planning Commission to consider proposed amendments to the General Plan Housing Element, Land Use Element, Safety Element, Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan, Elsinore Area Plan, Highgrove Area Plan, Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, Lakeview Nuevo Area Plan, Mead Valley Area Plan, Pass Area Plan, Temescal Canyon Area Plan, Western Coachella Valley Area Plan, Appendix A-1 Glossary, Appendix E-1 Socioeconomic Buildout Assumptions and Methodology, Appendix K-1 Implementation, and Appendix P-1 Housing Element Land Inventory and Disadvantage Unincorporated Communities Analysis; and,

WHEREAS, all provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and Riverside County CEQA implementing procedures have been satisfied; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed General Plan Amendment No. 1122 was submitted to the California Housing and Community Development for a 60-day review on January 21, 2016; and, on March 21, 2016 the Riverside County 5th Cycle Housing Element received a conditional certification from HCD; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed General Plan Amendment was discussed fully with testimony and documentation presented by the public and affected government agencies; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside in regular session assembled on December 6, 2016 that:

1. **General Plan Amendment No. 1122 (GPA No. 1122)** is a component of the 5th Cycle Housing Element Update Project and is a proposal to amend the Housing Element pursuant to Government Code Section 65583 and the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Housing Element Guidelines. GPA No. 1122 has countywide application and amends the following sections of the General Plan to be consistent to the Housing Element: Land Use Element, Safety Element, Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan, Elsinore Area Plan, Highgrove Area Plan, Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, Lakeview Nuevo Area Plan, Mead Valley Area Plan, Pass Area Plan, Temescal Canyon Area Plan,

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
DATE 11/22/16
BY MICHELLE CLACK

1 Western Coachella Valley Area Plan, Appendix A-1 Glossary, Appendix K-1 Implementation Program,
2 and Appendix P-1 Housing Element Land Inventory and Disadvantage Unincorporated Communities
3 Analysis; as shown on Attachment B to the December 6, 2016, Board of Supervisors staff report
4 incorporated herein by this this reference. GPA No. 1122 is associated with Environmental Impact Report
5 No. 548, Change of Zone No. 7902 and Ordinance No. 348.4840 (collectively, the Project) which were
6 considered concurrently at the public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of
7 Supervisors. Ordinance No. 348.4840 establishes two new zoning classifications the Mixed Use (MU)
8 Zone and the Highest Density Zone (R-7) to implement the goals of the Housing Element update. Change
9 of Zone No. 7902 and the associated Ordinance No. 348.4841 will rezone specified parcels to the MU Zone
10 and the R-7 Zone to be consistent with GPA No. 1122 proposed land use amendments. The Planning
11 Commission recommended approval of GPA No. 1122 with modifications on October 5, 2016.

12 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** by the Board of Supervisors, based on evidence presented on this
13 matter, both written and oral, including Environmental Impact Report No. 548 that:

14 1. **Housing Element:** GPA No. 1122 replaces the General Plan Housing Element in its
15 entirety with an updated version of the Housing Element as shown in Attachment B to the December 6,
16 2016 Board of Supervisor staff report. The Housing Element has County-wide application and is required
17 to be reviewed and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development
18 (HCD) to ensure that the Housing Element complies with the State Housing Laws. The Housing Element
19 includes an analysis and inventory of suitable lands that can accommodate the projected housing needs for
20 the 5th Cycle Housing Element Update. The suitable areas located throughout the County within the
21 boundaries of nine General Plan Area Plans.

22 2. **Land Use Element:** GPA No. 1122 amends the Land Use Element to include a discussion
23 regarding underserved disadvantage communities under the “Infrastructure, Public Facilities, and Service
24 Provision” of the Land Use Element, amends the Mixed-Use Planning Area Section of the Land Use
25 Element, amends the description of the MUA to elaborate on the purpose and key features of a MUA
26 development. GPA No. 1122 also adds two new Land Use Policies Land Use 33.1 (LU 33.1) and LU 33.2
27 to implement the MUA Land Use Designation, amends the following: Table LU-1 Unincorporated
28 Riverside County Cumulative Acreage Summary, Table LU-2 Unincorporated Riverside County Buildout

Capacity Summary, Table LU-4 Land Use Designations Summary, Figure LU-1 Land Use Designation Key, and Table LU-5 Population per Square Mile to reflect the proposed land use designation amendments and updated MUA Land Use Designation nomenclature as shown in Attachment B.

3. **Safety Element:** GPA No. 1122 amends the Safety Element to address the risk of fire in state responsibility areas and very high fire hazard severity zones. Additional information to support fire and emergency management plans are proposed in the Safety Element under the following sections “Technical Background Report”, “Other General Plan Elements”, “Fire Hazards”, “Building Code and Performance Standards”, and “Long-Range Fire Safety Planning”.

4. **Land Use Element Area Plan Updates:** GPA No. 1122 amends nine General Plan Area Plans’ text and policies to establish Highest Density Residential (HHDR)/Mixed-Use Area (MUA) Town Centers and a Mixed-Use Area Overlay to accommodate the RHNA allocation. Each Area Plan includes a general description of the proposed HHDR or MUA Town Centers unique to the Communities in which they are located. The proposed Town Centers are comprised of Neighborhoods ranging from a single Neighborhood to eleven Neighborhoods. Each Neighborhood is characterized as either an HHDR or MUA Neighborhood. The HHDR Neighborhoods are to be developed in their entirety in accordance with HHDR Land Use Designation. Each MUA Neighborhood includes a required percentage to be dedicated to HHDR development in order to meet the regional housing needs. As shown on Attachment B, GPA No. 1122 amends the following General Plan Area Plans:

- a. The Elsinore Area Plan (ELAP) to include descriptions and policies for the Meadowbrook Town Center and Lee Lake Community, respectively under the “Overlays and Policy Areas” and “Land Use” Sections of the Area Plan. GPA No. 1122 also amends approximately 0.43 gross acres of Open Space: Water (OS-W) and approximately 2.06 gross acres of Community Development: Light Industrial (CD-LI) to the Open Space: Conservation Habitat (OS-CH) Land Use Designation and approximately 3 gross acres of OS-W and 30 gross acres of CD-LI to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the Lee Lake Community into ELAP Figure 3. GPA No. 1122 updates Table 2: Statistical Summary of ELAP to reflect the proposed Land Use Designation amendments. GPA No. 1122 also

incorporates new Figure 3a Meadowbrook Town Center and Figure 3b Lee Lake Community to the ELAP.

b. The Mead Valley Area Plan (MVAP) to include descriptions and policies for the Good Hope Community, Mead Valley I-215/Nuevo Road Vicinity Community, and Mead Valley Town Center under the “Land Use” Section of the Area Plan. GPA No. 1122 also amends approximately 104 gross acres of Community Development: Medium Density Residential (CD-MDR), 20 gross acres of CD-CR, 7 gross acres of CD-LI to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation and 17 gross acres of CD-MDR to the CD-HHDR Land Use Designation to incorporate the Good Hope Community into MVAP Figure 3. GPA No. 1122 amends approximately 11 gross acres of Community Development: Business Park (CD-BP) to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the Mead Valley I-215/Nuevo Road Vicinity Community in MVAP Figure 3. Additionally, GPA No. 1122 amends approximately 64 gross acres of CD-CR to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the Mead Valley Town Center into MVAP Figure 3 and updates Table 2: Statistical Summary of MVAP to reflect the proposed Land Use Designation amendments and incorporates new Figure 3a Good Hope Community, Figure 3b Mead Valley I-215/Nuevo Road Vicinity Community, and Figure 3c Mead Valley Town Center to the MVAP.

c. The Temescal Canyon Area Plan (TCAP) to include a description and policies for Home Gardens Town Center Overlay under the “Overlay” section of the Area Plan. This overlay consists of four MUA Neighborhoods that totals approximately 63 gross acres. To incorporate the Town Center Overlay in the Area Plan, GPA No. 1122 updates Figure 4 TCAP Policy Area and Overlay and Table 2: Statistical Summary of TCVAP. GPA No. 1122 also incorporates new Figure 3a Home Gardens Town Center Overlay to the TCAP.

d. Highgrove Area Plan (HAP) to include a description and policies for the Highgrove Town Center under the “Policy Areas” section of the Area Plan. GPA No. 1122 also amends approximately 20 gross acres of CD-LI to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation; as well as, amend approximately 20 gross acres of Community Development: Low Density residential (CD-LDR) to the CD-HHDR Land Use Designation to incorporate Highgrove Town Center

1 into HAP Figure 3. GPA No. 1122 also updates Table 2: Statistical Summary of HAP to
2 reflect the proposed Land Use Designation amendments and incorporates new Figure 3a
3 Highgrove Town Center to the HAP.

- 4 e. The Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan (HVWAP) to include descriptions and policies
5 for the Winchester Community (Western Area) and Winchester Town Center within the
6 "Land Use" section of the Area Plan. GPA No. 1122 amends approximately 230 gross acres
7 of CD-MDR to the MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the Winchester Community
8 into HVAP Figure 3, amends approximately 244 gross acres of CD-MDR, 12 gross acres of
9 CD-CR, and 41 gross acres of CD-LDR to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation; as well as,
10 amend 33 gross acres of CD-MDR to the CD-HHDR Land Use Designation to incorporate
11 the Winchester Town Center into HVWAP Figure 3. GPA No. 1122 also updates Table 2:
12 Statistical Summary of HVWAP to reflect the proposed Land Use Designation amendments
13 and incorporates new Figure 3a Winchester Community and Figure 3b Winchester Town
14 Center to the HVWAP.

- 15 f. The Western Coachella Area Plan (WCVAP) to include descriptions and policies for the
16 Desert Edge, I-10/Haugen Lehmann Avenue Community, North Palm Springs Community,
17 Rushmore/Kimdale Community, Thousand Palms Community (I-10/Cook St.) and
18 Thousand Palms Town Center within the "Land Use" Section of the Area Plan. GPA No.
19 1122 amends approximately 20 gross acres of CD-CR to the CD-MUA Land Use
20 Designation to incorporate the Desert Edge Community into WCVAP Figure 3. GPA No.
21 1122 also amends 34 gross acres of CD-MDR and 2 gross acres of CD-CR to the CD-MUA
22 Land Use Designation to incorporate the I-10/Haugen Lemann Avenue Community into
23 WCVAP Figure 3. GPA No. 1122 amends 164 gross acres of Community Development:
24 Medium High Density Residential (CD-MHDR), 40 gross acres of CD-MDR and 40 gross
25 acres of CD-CR to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the North Palm
26 Springs Community into WCVAP Figure 3. The Rushmore/Kimdale Community consists
27 of a single HHDR Neighborhood of approximately 71 gross acres. The proposed Policies
28 WCVAP 8.55 through WCVAP 8.57 guides development within the Rushmore/Kimdale

Community. GPA No. 1122 amends the designation for approximately 71 gross acres of CD-MDR to the CD-HHDR Land Use Designation to incorporate the Rushmore/Kimdale Community into WCVAP Figure 3. The Thousand Palms Community (I-10/Cook Street Vicinity) consists of a single MUA Neighborhood that is approximately 69 gross acres. GPA No. 1122 amends approximately 34 gross acres of CD-BP and 35 gross acres of CD-CR to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the Thousand Palms Community into WCVAP Figure 3. The proposed Policies WCVAP 8.22 through WCVAP 8.34 guides development within the Thousand Palms Community. GPA No. 1122 amends approximately 276 gross acres of CD-CR, 262 gross acres of CD-MHDR, 3 gross acres of CD-High Density Residential and 61 gross acres of CD-MDR to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the Thousand Palms Town Center into WCVAP Figure 3. GPA No. 1122 also updates Table 2: Statistical Summary of WCVAP to reflect the proposed land use designation amendments and incorporates new Figure 3a Desert Edge, Figure 3b I-10/Haugen Lehmann Avenue Community, Figure 3c North Palm Springs Community, Figure 3d Rushmore/Kimdale Community, Figure 3e Thousand Palms Community (I-10/Cook St.), and Figure 3f Thousand Palms Town Center to the WCVAP.

- g. The Eastern Coachella Area Plan (ECVAP) to include descriptions and policies for the Mecca Town Center, North Shore Town Center, Oasis Town Center and Thermal Town Center within the "Land Use" Section of the Area Plan. The Mecca Town Center consists of five MUA Neighborhoods and a single HHDR Neighborhood that totals approximately 636 gross acres. The proposed Policies ECVAP 3.3 through ECVAP 3.24 guides development within the Mecca Town Center. GPA No. 1122 proposes to amend approximately 78 gross acres of Rural: Rural Residential (R-RR) and 118 gross acres of Agriculture: Agriculture (AG-AG) within the Community Development Overlay, and 20 gross acres of CD-CR, 48 gross acres of CD-MDR, and 57 gross acres of Community Development: Very High Density Residential (CD-VHDR) to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation; as well as, amend 163 gross acres of CD-HDR and 81 gross acres of CD-MHDR to the CD-HHDR Land Use Designation to incorporate the Mecca Town Center into ECVAP Figure 3. The proposed

1 Policies ECVAP 3.25 through ECVAP 3.37 guides development within the North Shore
2 Town Center. GPA No. 1122 proposes to amend 51 gross acres of Community Development:
3 Highest Density Residential (CD-HDR) and 10 gross acres of Community Development:
4 Very Low Density Residential (CD-VLDR) to the CD-HHDR Land Use Designation; as
5 well as, amend 8 gross acres of CD-MDR, 11 gross acres of CD-HDR, 39 gross acres of CD-
6 CR, and 179 gross acres of Community Development: Commercial Tourist (CD-CT) to the
7 CD-MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the North Shore Town Center into ECVAP
8 Figure 3. The proposed Policies ECVAP 3.38 through ECVAP 3.49 guides development
9 within the Oasis Town Center. GPA No. 1122 proposes to amend 55 gross acres of CD-CR
10 and 148 gross acres of AG-AG to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation to incorporate the
11 Oasis Town Center into ECVAP Figure 3. The Thermal Town Center consists of two MUA
12 Neighborhoods that total approximately 160 gross acres to incorporate the Thermal Town
13 Center in the Area Plan Land Use Map Figure 3. The proposed Policies ECVAP 3.50 through
14 ECVAP 3.63 guides development within the Thermal Town Center. GPA No. 1122 proposes
15 to amend 80 gross acres of CD-MHDR, and 80 gross acres of CD-LI to the MUA Land Use
16 Designation to incorporate the Thermal Town Center into ECVAP Figure 3. GPA No. 1122
17 also updates Table 2: Statistical Summary of ECVAP to reflect the proposed Land Use
18 Designation amendments and incorporates new Figure 3a Mecca Town Center, Figure 3b
19 North Shore Town Center, Figure 3c Oasis Town Center, and Figure 3d Thermal Town
20 Center to the ECVAP.

- 21 h. The Lakeview Nuevo Area Plan (LNAP) to include descriptions and policies for the
22 Lakeview Town Center and the Nuevo Community (Western Area). The Lakeview Town
23 Center consists of three MUA neighborhoods and two HHDR neighborhoods of
24 approximately 251 gross acres. The proposed Policies LNAP 6.2 through LNAP 6.25 guides
25 development within the Lakeview Town Center. GPA No. 1122 amends approximately 206
26 gross acres of CD-MDR, 16 gross acres of CD-CR, and 9 gross acres of CD-MHDR to the
27 CD-MUA Land Use Designation; as well as, amend 5 gross acres of CD-MDR and 15 gross
28 acres of CD-CR to the CD-HHDR Land Use Designation. The proposed Policies LNAP 6.26

1 through LNAP 6.31 guides development within the Nuevo Community. GPA No. 1122
2 amends approximately 84 gross acres of CD-CR and 71 gross acres CD-MDR to the CD-
3 HHDR Land Use Designation. GPA No. 1122 also updates Table 2: Statistical Summary of
4 LVNAP to reflect the proposed Land Use Designation amendments and incorporates new
5 Figure 3a Lakeview Town Center and Figure 3b Nuevo Community to the LVNAP.

- 6 i. The Pass Area Plan (PASS) to include a description and policies for the Cabazon Town
7 Center. This town center consists of six MUA neighborhoods and five HHDR
8 neighborhoods that total approximately 364 gross acres. GPA No. 1122 amends the Land
9 Use Designation of approximately 10 gross acres of Community Development: Heavy
10 Industrial (CD-HI), 70 gross acres of CD-CR, 124 gross acres of CD-LI, 82 gross acres of
11 CD-LDR, 13 gross acres of CD-MDR to the CD-MUA Land Use Designation; as well as,
12 15 gross acres of CD-CR, 34 gross acres of CD-LDR, 10 gross acres of CD-MDR to the CD-
13 HHDR Land Use Designation to incorporate the Town Center into PASS Figure 3. The
14 proposed Policies PASS 5.7 through PASS 5.33 guides development within the Cabazon
15 Town Center. GPA No. 1122 also updates Figure 3 PASS Land Use Plan and Table 2:
16 Statistical Summary of PASS to reflect the proposed Land Use Designation amendments
17 and incorporates new Figure 3a Cabazon Town Center to the PASS.

18 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors,** based on the evidence presented
19 on this matter, both written and oral, including Program Environmental Impact Report No. 548, that:

- 20 1. The Project's objective is to update the County's Housing Element pursuant to State law and
21 to address the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. The RHNA is
22 mandated by State Housing Law as part of the periodic process of updating local housing
23 elements of the General Plan. The RHNA quantifies the need for housing within each
24 jurisdiction during specified planning periods. Communities use the RHNA in land use
25 planning, prioritizing local resource allocation, and in deciding how to address identified
26 existing and future housing needs resulting from population, employment and household
27 growth. The RHNA does not necessarily encourage or promote growth, but rather allows
28 communities to anticipate growth, so that collectively the region and subregion can grow in

ways that enhance quality of life, improve access to jobs, promotes transportation mobility, and addresses both social equity and fair share housing needs. The RHNA housing unit allocation was prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in conjunction with the State of California for the planning period of October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2021. For this Housing Element update, the Project demonstrates that the County can accommodate its 45,271 RHNA units for all income categories.

2. The RHNA allocation are split into four income categories, which are “Very Low”, “Low”, “Moderate”, and “Above Moderate”. Based on the updated housing inventory and approved projects, the County currently has the capacity to accommodate the “Moderate” and “Above Moderate” income categories and must demonstrate it can accommodate 25,174 units for the “Very Low” and “Low” income categories. GPA No. 1122 amends the land use designation of various parcels to Highest Density Residential (HHDR) to provide the capacity for 12,587 units. The remaining half may be accommodated in compact mixed use development through the General Plan Mixed-Use Area (MUA) Land Use Designation, provided that a percentage of the development shall accommodate HHDR development.
3. The Project presents an opportunity for the County to carry forward the General Plan Concepts for compact transit adaptive mixed use development through selectively applying the HHDR and MUA Land Use Designations in suitable locations. Policies crafted for each HHDR and MUA Town Center and Community provides for the development of a variety of housing types, styles and density to meet the needs of a range of lifestyle, physical abilities, and income level. The proposed policies will ensure that supporting infrastructure such as adequate circulation facilities, water resources, and sewer facilities to meet the demands of the future HHDR and MUA development. To provide for walkability, each community incorporates the integration of parks, paseos, public squares, bicycle trails, transit systems, and pedestrian paths to connect new communities to existing or future development.
4. GPA No. 1122 involves the following general plan amendments: Entitlement/Policy Amendment, Agricultural Foundation Component amendment and a Technical Amendment.

- 1 5. For the Entitlement/Policy Amendment, the following findings are required pursuant to
2 Article II, Section 2.4.f.(2) of Ordinance No. 348: the proposed change does not involve a
3 change in or conflict with the Riverside County Vision; any General Plan Principle set forth
4 in General Plan Appendix B; or, any Foundation Component designation in the General
5 Plan; the proposed amendment would either contribute to the purposes of the General Plan
6 or, at a minimum, would not be detrimental to them; and, an amendment is required to
7 comply with an update of the Housing Element or change in State Housing Element law.
- 8 6. GPA No. 1122 supports the Riverside County Vision which provides that new growth
9 patterns no longer reflect a pattern of random sprawl. Rather, they follow a framework of
10 transportation and open space corridors, with concentrations of development that fit into that
11 framework. In other words, important open space and transportation corridors define growth
12 areas. Additionally, growth focus in Riverside County is on quality, not on frustrating efforts
13 to halt growth, and population growth continues and is focused where it can best be
14 accommodated. Growth is also well coordinated between cities and Riverside County and
15 they jointly influence periodic State and regional growth forecasts affecting Riverside
16 County and its cities. The Riverside County Vision Statement also identifies the “richly
17 varied range of income categories” available within the County and also provides that
18 “housing is available in every increment of this range”. The Housing Element supports the
19 General Plan Vision Statement by identifying the various income levels and associated
20 housing needs that need to be met for each category. Furthermore, the Housing Element
21 identifies funding opportunities, establishes programs and policies, and prescribes
22 responsibilities for several County departments to implement the policies established as part
23 of the Housing Element. Therefore, by integrating the Housing Element into the General
24 Plan, the County’s Vision is promulgated and would not change or conflict with the addition
25 of an updated Housing Element. General Plan Amendment No. 1122 is a component of the
26 Housing Element and part of the implementation of the Housing Element.
- 27 7. Additionally, the proposed MUA/HHDR Town Centers and Communities are within or near
28 areas that support Community Development land uses. These areas are ideally located near

existing highways, or major corridors, located near existing or future transit stations, and are located near civic centers such as schools, hospitals, parks, and community centers. The proposed policies for each Town Center encourages connectivity through open space, trails, bicycle paths, and other community amenities, it encourages a mix of housing types and styles, commercial and public uses. GPA No. 1122 supports MUA and HHDR development that can accommodate the RHNA allocation assigned to the County.

8. The update to the Safety Element and Appendix K-2 further acknowledges that the security of person and property is one of the most basic community needs and commit to designing our communities so that vulnerability to natural and man-made hazards is anticipated and kept to a minimum.
9. The update to the Land Use Element and Appendix P-2 also supports the County's Vision to "balance stability in the landscape with the dynamism and flexibility to adapt to changing future circumstances." For each identified Disadvantage Underserved Communities, deficiencies in water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, and structural fire protection are addressed through funding or financing alternatives that could make the service extensions to the Disadvantage Underserved Communities financially feasible.
10. GPA No. 1122 does not conflict with any General Plan Principle. The General Plan provides several Principles that establish direction for land use, economic, and housing development. Specifically, subsection D of Appendix B provides that "the Housing Element should be revised to adopt policies that address the real-world projections of overall housing growth and demands for housing of varied type, style, price and density, which encourage a wide range of choices and opportunities within the framework of the larger economy and the realities of the marketplace." The County's updated and revised Housing Element specifically implements these provisions. The Housing Element will include programs and policies are proposed within the County's Action Plan to meet the overall housing demands in the County for all specified income categories.
11. The amendments to the Land Use Element MUA Land Use Designation description, nine Area Plans to establish the HHDR and MUA Town Centers, and the parcel specific land use

1 amendment to MUA and HHDR designations supports the General Plan Principles for
2 Community Design. The HHDR and MUA Town Centers provide opportunity to establish
3 a variety of housing types, fostering communities that vary in size type and environmental
4 settings, and ensures a balance of jobs, housing within communities. The MUA and HHDR
5 Town Centers are located in areas surrounding existing and projected commercial and
6 industrial clusters. Each Town Center promotes the development of a “unique community
7 identity” to create a special sense of place with distinct boundary and edge conditions. Each
8 of the proposed Town Centers has policies to integrate regional transit/transportation system
9 with appropriate planning for transit terminals and high density clustering housing.

10 12. Additionally, the update to the Safety Element and update to the Land Use Element in
11 compliance with SB 1241 and SB 244 supports the Community Development Principle.

12 13. GPA No. 1122 does not conflict with any Foundation Component designation in the General
13 Plan. The County’s Housing Element and associated General Plan Amendment is a policy
14 document that sets forth programs and policies to address the County’s affordable housing
15 needs. GPA No. 1122 does not change any General Plan Foundation Components.
16 Therefore, the integration of the Housing Element into the General Plan will not cause a
17 change or conflict with any Foundation Component designation in the General Plan.

18 14. Additionally, the amendments to the Land Use Element MUA designation description, nine
19 Area Plans to establish MUA and HHDR Town Centers, Appendix E-2, and the parcel
20 specific land use amendment to MUA and HHDR Land Use Designation are consistent with
21 the Community Development Foundation Component. The intent of the Community
22 Development Foundation Component is “to provide a breadth of land uses that foster variety
23 and choice, accommodate a range of life styles, living and working conditions, and
24 accommodate diverse community settings. The goal is to accommodate a balance of jobs,
25 housing, and services within communities to help achieve other aspects of the Riverside
26 County RCIP Vision, such as mobility, open space, and air quality goals.” The Project
27 fosters the development of communities that would achieve the goals of the Community
28 Development Foundation Component through the proposed policies and direct land use